arXiv:1610.08162v1 [math.DG] 26 Oct 2016

ON LAWSON-OSSERMAN CONSTRUCTIONS

XIAOWEI XU, LING YANG AND YONGSHENG ZHANG

Abstract. Lawson-Osserman [30] constructed three types of non-parametric minimal cones of higher codimension based on Hopf fibrations between Euclidean spheres, which can been seen as Lipschitz solutions to the minimal surface equations which are not C^1, thereby making sharp contrast to the regularity theorem for minimal hypersurfaces in Euclidean spaces. In this paper, the above constructions are generalized in a more general scheme. Once a mapping f can be written as the composition of a Riemannian submersion from a Euclidean sphere and an isometric minimal immersion into another Euclidean sphere, the graph of f yields a non-parametric minimal cone. Because the choices of the second component form huge moduli spaces, our constructions produce a constellation of uncountable many examples. For each such cone, there exists an entire minimal graph whose tangent cone at infinity is just the given one. Moreover, surprising phenomena on the existence, non-uniqueness and non-minimizing for the Dirichlet problem are discovered, due to the amusing spiral asymptotic behaviour of a particular autonomous system on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Lawson-Osserman maps 6
2.1. Necessary and sufficient conditions for LOSs 6
2.2. Characterizations of trivial LOMs 9
2.3. Nontrivial LOMs whose nonzero singular values are equal 10
2.4. LOMSEs of (n,p,k)-type 13
3. On Dirichlet problems related to LOMSEs 19
3.1. Necessary and sufficient conditions for minimal graphs 19
3.2. Entire minimal graphs associated to LOMSEs 22
3.3. Non-uniqueness and non-minimizing of minimal graphs 28
4. Appendix 30
4.1. Proof of Lemma 2.1 30

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 58E20,53A10.

4.2. Proof of Corollary 2.2 32

4.3. Proof of Proposition 3.1 33

4.4. Proof of Proposition 3.2 38

References 46

1. Introduction

The research on minimal graphs in Euclidean spaces has a long and fertile history. Among others, the **Dirichlet problem** (cf. [23, 4, 13, 34, 30, 42]) is a central topic in this subject:

Let Ω be a bounded and strictly convex domain in the d_1-dimensional Euclidean space with boundary of class C^r for $r \geq 2$. It asks, for a given (vector-valued) function $f : \partial\Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ of class C^s where $0 \leq s \leq r$, what kind of and how many (vector-valued) functions $F \in C^0(\overline{\Omega}) \bigcap Lip(\Omega)$ exist so that F satisfies the minimal surface equation(s) in the weak sense (or equivalently, the graph of F is minimal in the sense of [1]*) and $F|_{\partial\Omega} = f$.*

For the case of codimension 1 (i.e. $d_2 = 1$), we have a fairly profound understanding as follows.

- Given arbitrary boundary data of class C^0, by the works of J. Douglas [14], T. Radó [37, 38], Jenkins-Serrin [23] and Bombieri-de Giorgi-Maranda [4], there exists a unique Lipschitz solution to the Dirichlet problem.
- Furthermore, due to the works of E. de Giorgi [13] and J. Moser [34], this solution turns out to be analytic.
- Each solution gives an absolutely area-minimizing graph by virtue of the convexity of $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ and §5.4.18 of [18]. As a consequence, it is stable.

Utterly unlike the above, the higher codimensional situation (i.e. $d_2 \geq 2$) becomes much more complicated. Even for the simplest domain $\mathbb{D}^{d_1}$ (the unit Euclidean disk) in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, H. B. Lawson and R. Osserman [30] discovered astonishing phenomena that reveal essential differences.

- For $d_1 = d_2 = 2$, some real analytic boundary data can be constructed so that there exist at least three different analytic solutions to the Dirichlet problem. Moreover, one of them corresponds to an unstable minimal surface.
- For $d_1 \geq 4$ and $3 \leq d_2 \leq d_1 - 1$, the Dirichlet problem is generally not solvable. In fact, for each $f : S^{d_1-1} \to S^{d_2-1}$ that is not homotopic to zero, there exists a positive constant c only depending on f, such that the problem is unsolvable for the boundary data $f_\varphi := \varphi f$ with $\varphi \geq c$.
- For certain boundary data, there exists a Lipschitz solution to the Dirichlet problem which is not C^1.

As shown in [30], the nonexistence and irregularity of the Dirichlet problem have an intrinsic relationship as follows. Given f that represents a non-trivial element of $\pi_{d_1-1}(S^{d_2-1})$, the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data f_φ is solvable when φ is small (due to the implicit function theorem) and non-solvable when φ is large. This leads Lawson-Osserman to suspect there exists a critical value φ_0 that corresponds to a sort of singular solution. In particular, when f is a Hopf map between two Euclidean spheres, the symmetries indicate that this singular solution generates a non-parametric minimal cone. More precisely, let $H^{2m-1,m}$ denote the Hopf fibration from S^{2m-1} onto S^m ($m = 2, 4$ or 8), a calculation in [30] shows

$$M_m := \{(\cos\theta_m \cdot x, \sin\theta_m \cdot H^{2m-1,m}(x)) : x \in S^{2m-1}\} \tag{1.1}$$

with

$$\theta_m := \arccos\sqrt{\frac{4(m-1)}{3(2m-1)}} \tag{1.2}$$

is a compact minimal submanifold in S^{3m}, and the cone C_m generated by this submanifold is an non-parametric minimal cone, since it can be viewed as the graph of $F_m : \mathbb{R}^{2m} \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$F_m(y) = \begin{cases} \tan\theta_m|y| \cdot H^{2m-1,m}(\frac{y}{|y|}) & y \neq 0, \\ 0 & y = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

In other words, the restriction of F_m on $\mathbb{D}^{2m}$ is a Lipschitz solution to the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data $\tan\theta_m \cdot H^{2m-1,m}$.

To generalize the above Lawson-Osserman construction in a more general framework, we introduce the following concepts that shall play a central role in the present paper.

Definition 1.1. *Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be a smooth map, if there exists an acute angle θ, such that*

$$M_{f,\theta} := \{(\cos\theta \cdot x, \sin\theta \cdot f(x)) : x \in S^n\} \subset S^{n+m+1} \tag{1.4}$$

is a minimal submanifold in S^{n+m+1}, then f is said to be a **Lawson-Osserman map (LOM)**, *$M_{f,\theta}$ is called the associated* **Lawson-Osserman submanifold (LOS)**, *and the cone $C_{f,\theta}$ generated by $M_{f,\theta}$ is the corresponding* **Lawson-Osserman cone (LOC)** *in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$.*

In this paper, all the **Lawson-Osserman maps whose nonzero singular values are equal (LOMSEs)** and corresponding LOSs, LOCs are systematically studied from several viewpoints.

Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOM that is not a totally geodesic isometric embedding. f is called an LOMSE once the nonzero singular values of f_* at each point $x \in S^n$ are equal to $\lambda(x)$ (λ may depend on x). One can conclude that $\lambda(x) \equiv \lambda$ and the rank of f_* are always equal to p (see Theorem 2.2 (ii)). Moreover, each components of this vector-valued function f, i.e. $f_1, \cdots, f_{m+1}$ are all harmonic spherical functions of degree $k \geq 2$ (see Theorem 2.3). In this case, f is said to be an **LOMSE of (n,p,k)-type**. It is worthy to note that, the Hopf map from S^{2m-1} onto S^m

is an LOMSE of $(2m-1, 2m, 2)$-type, with $m = 2, 4$ or 8. Hence the LOMSEs and corresponding LOSs, LOCs are natural generalizations of Lawson-Osserman's original constructions.

A characterization of LOMSEs shall be established in Theorem 2.2, which says that each of them is composed of a Riemannian submersion from S^n with connected fibers and an isometric minimal immersion into S^m. In fact, the first part of this composition has to be a Hopf fibration onto complex projective spaces, quaterninonic projective spaces or the octonionic project plane, due to a wonderful result in [43], while the second choices usually form a moduli space of large dimension (see [8, 41, 40]), yielding a huge number of LOMSEs along with the associated LOSs and LOCs. Note that except for the three original Lawson-Osserman cones, $m > n$ always happen in our construction, indicating that the non-triviality of f in $\pi_n(S^m)$ is unnecessary for the existence of non-parametric minimal cones.

Although there exist uncountable number of LOMSEs, the singular value λ of each LOMSE f and the acute angle θ in the associated LOS $M_{f,\theta}$ are both constants only depending on the values of (n, p, k) (see Theorem 2.3), hence lying in two discrete sets, respectively. As corollaries, several interesting gap phenomena for several geometric quantities of LOSs or LOCs associated to LOMSEs, e.g. the angles between the normal planes and the fixed references plane, the volumes, the Jordan angles and the slope functions, are revealed in Corollary 2.2. It worths to point out that the rigidity properties for these quantities of compact minimal submanifolds in spheres or entire minimal graphs in Euclidean spaces have been studied in many literatures, e.g. [2, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 11, 36, 29].

For any LOM f, denote $F_{f,\theta} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$F_{f,\theta}(y) = \begin{cases} \tan\theta |y| f(\frac{y}{|y|}) & y \neq 0, \\ 0 & y = 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

Then $C_{f,\theta}$ is the graph of $F_{f,\theta}$ and hence $F_{f,\theta}|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}}$ is a Lipschitz solution to the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data $f_{\varphi_0} := \varphi_0 f$ with $\varphi_0 := \tan\theta$. Motivated by the argument of Lawson-Osserman [30], we continue to search analytic solutions to Dirichlet problem for the boundary data $f_\varphi := \varphi f$. A candidate of such solutions is written as

$$F_{f,\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} \rho(|y|) f(\frac{y}{|y|}) & y \neq 0 \\ 0 & y = 0 \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Here ρ is a smooth positive function on $(0, b)$ (b is a positive number or $+\infty$), satisfying $\lim\limits_{r\to 0^+} \rho = 0$. Once

$$M_{f,\rho} := \{(rx, \rho(r) f(x)) : x \in S^n, r \in (0, b)\} \tag{1.7}$$

(i.e. the graph of $F_{f,\rho}$ minus the origin) is a minimal submanifold and $\rho_r(0) = 0$, the interior regularity theorem for partial differential equations of elliptic type (see [33]) ensures $F_{f,\rho}$ to be an analytic solution to the minimal surface equations. Observing that the minimality is invariant under homothety, F_{f,ρ_d} is also an analytic solution, where $\rho_d(r) := \frac{1}{d}\rho(dr)$. Therefore, each intersection of the graph of ρ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the

straight line $\rho = \varphi \cdot r$ enables us to construct the corresponding analytic solution to the Dirichlet problem for f_φ on S^n.

In particular, if f is an LOMSE, the minimal surface equations are reduced to (3.18), a nonlinear ordinary differential equation of second order, which can be transferred to an autonomous system (3.25) in the $\varphi\psi$-plane, by putting $\varphi := \frac{\rho}{r}$, $t := \log r$ and $\psi := \varphi_t$. By carefully choosing suitable barrier functions, one can show the existence of a long-time bounded solution to (3.25), whose corresponding orbit in the phase space emits from the origin - a saddle critical point and limits to $P_1(\varphi_0, 0)$ - a stable critical point (see Proposition 3.1-3.2).

Quite subtly, there are two different types of asymptotic behaviors aroud P_1 depending on the values of (n, p, k) for f:

(I) P_1 is a stable center whenever $(n, p, k) = (3, 2, 2), (5, 4, 2), (5, 4, 4)$ or $n \geq 7$;
(II) P_1 is a stable spiral point whenever $(n, p) = (3, 2)$, $k \geq 4$ or $(n, p) = (5, 4)$, $k \geq 6$.





As a consequence, the graphs the solutions ρ to (3.18) are illustrated below, respectively for LOMSEs of Type (I) and Type (II):





Much interesting information can be read off from the above pictures:

(A) For the LOC associated to each LOMSE, there exists an entire analytic minimal graph whose tangent cone at infinity is exactly the given one (see Theorem 3.3).
(B) For any LOMSE of Type (II), there exist infinitely many analytic solutions to the Dirichlet problem for f_{φ_0}; meanwhile, this problem also has a singular Lipschitz solution which corresponds to the truncated LOC (see Theorem 3.4).
(C) For Type (II), although a Lipschitz solution arises when for the boundary data f_{φ_0}, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that the Dirichlet problem still have analytic solutions for f_φ with $\varphi \in (\varphi_0, \varphi_0 + \epsilon)$.
(D) By the monotonicity of density for minimal submanifolds in Euclidean spaces (see [18, 12]), LOCs associated to LOMSEs of Type (II) are all non-minimizing (see Theorem 3.5).

To the knowledge of the authors of the present paper, it seems to be the first time to have phenomena (B)-(C) observed, and hard to foresee the occurrence from the classical theory of partial differential equations.

The LOC associated to the Hopf map from S^3 onto S^2 (i.e. the LOMSE of $(3, 2, 2)$-type) was shown to be area-minimizing by Harvey-Lawson [22], with the aid of their calibration device. This leads us to ask whether the associated LOC $C_{f,\theta}$ is area-minimizing for an LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type, and Theorem 3.5 gives a partial answer to this question. Later, in a subsequent paper [49] of the authors, we shall explore this subject from a different viewpoint. The standard LOMSEs of $(5, 4, 2)$, $(7, 4, 2)$ and $(15, 8, 2)$-type can be proved area-minimizing.

2. Lawson-Osserman maps

2.1. **Necessary and sufficient conditions for LOSs.** Let S^d be the d-dimensional Euclidean sphere, equipped with the canonical metric g_d. (S^d, g_d) can be seen as an embedded hypersurface in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. The inclusion map is denoted by i_d, and the second fundamental form B_d at $x \in S^d$ satisfies $B_d(v, w) = -\langle v, w\rangle \mathbf{Y}$ with $v, w \in T_x S^d$ and $\mathbf{Y}$ denoting the position vector of x in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

Given a smooth map f from S^n into S^m and an acute angle θ, let $I_{f,\theta} : S^n \to S^{n+m+1}$

$$I_{f,\theta}(x) = (\cos\theta \cdot x, \sin\theta \cdot f(x)) \tag{2.1}$$

be the embedding associated to f and θ, and $g := I_{f,\theta}^* g_{n+m+1}$ is the pull-back metric on S^n. Now we explore the necessary and sufficient conditions ensuring $I_{f,\theta}$ to be a minimal isometric embedding.

Let $\mathbf{X}(x)$ be the position vector of $I_{f,\theta}(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$, then

$$\mathbf{X}(x) = (\cos\theta \mathbf{Y}_1(x), \sin\theta \mathbf{Y}_2(x)) \tag{2.2}$$

with $\mathbf{Y}_1(x)$ and $\mathbf{Y}_2(x)$ being the position vectors of x in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $f(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, respectively.

$\mathbf{X}$ can be viewed from 2 different angles. On the one hand, $\mathbf{X}$ is a vector-valued function on (S^n, g) and hence $\Delta_g \mathbf{X} = \tau(\mathbf{X})$. Here and in the sequel, Δ_g denotes the *Laplace-Beltrami operator* with respect to g and $\tau(\phi)$ is the *tension field* of a map ϕ between two Riemannian manifolds, see (1.2.8) of [46] for the explicit expression. On the other hand, $\mathbf{X} = i_{n+m+1} \circ I_{f,\theta}$, and thus the *composition formula for tension fields* (see (1.4.2) of [46]) enables us to derive

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_g \mathbf{X} &= \tau(\mathbf{X}) = \tau(i_{n+m+1} \circ I_{f,\theta}) \\ &= \tau(I_{f,\theta}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_{n+m+1}((I_{f,\theta})_* e_j, (I_{f,\theta})_* e_j) \\ &= \mathbf{H} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle (I_{f,\theta})_* e_j, (I_{f,\theta})_* e_j \rangle \mathbf{X} \\ &= \mathbf{H} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} g(e_j, e_j)\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{H} - n\mathbf{X}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Here $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(T_x S^n, g)$, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the Euclidean inner product, $\mathbf{H}$ is denoted to be the mean curvature field of (S^n, g) in S^{n+m+1}, whose value is taken in TS^{n+m+1}, and hence $\mathbf{H} \perp \mathbf{X}$ holds everywhere.

Similarly, $\mathbf{Y_1} = i_n \circ \mathbf{Id}$ with $\mathbf{Id}$ being the identity mapping from (S^n, g) to (S^n, g_n), and $\mathbf{Y_2} = i_m \circ f$. Again using the composition formula yields

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_1 &= \tau(\mathbf{Y}_1) = \tau(i_n \circ \mathbf{Id}) \\ &= \tau(\mathbf{Id}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_n(\mathbf{Id}_* e_j, \mathbf{Id}_* e_j) = \tau(\mathbf{Id}) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_n(e_j, e_j) \\ &= \tau(\mathbf{Id}) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle e_j, e_j \rangle \mathbf{Y}_1 = \tau(\mathbf{Id}) - 2e(\mathbf{Id})\mathbf{Y}_1\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

with $\tau(\mathbf{Id}) \perp \mathbf{Y}_1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_2 &= \tau(\mathbf{Y}_2) = \tau(i_m \circ f) \\ &= \tau(f) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_m(f_* e_j, f_* e_j) \\ &= \tau(f) - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle f_* e_j, f_* e_j \rangle \mathbf{Y}_2 = \tau(f) - 2e(f)\mathbf{Y}_2.\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

with $\tau(f) \perp \mathbf{Y}_2$. Here and in the sequel, $e(\phi)$ denotes the *energy density* of ϕ, see (1.2.3) of [46] for the explicit expression.

Combining (2.4) and (2.5), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_g \mathbf{X} &= (\cos\theta\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_1, \sin\theta\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_2)\\ &= \big(\cos\theta\big(\tau(\mathbf{Id}) - 2e(\mathbf{Id})\mathbf{Y}_1\big), \sin\theta\big(\tau(f) - 2e(f)\mathbf{Y}_2\big)\big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Comparing the right hand sides of (2.6) and (2.3) gives

$$\mathbf{H} = \big(\cos\theta\big(\tau(\mathbf{Id}) - (2e(\mathbf{Id}) - n)\mathbf{Y}_1\big), \sin\theta\big(\tau(f) - (2e(f) - n)\mathbf{Y}_2\big)\big)\,. \tag{2.7}$$

This enables us to deduce the following conclusion:

Theorem 2.1. *Let f be a smooth map from S^n into S^m and $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, then $I_{f,\theta}$ is a minimal isometric embedding from (S^n, g) into (S^{n+m+1}, g_{n+m+1}), i.e. $M_{f,\theta}$ is an LOS in S^{n+m+1} if and only if the following two conditions holds:*

(a) *$f : (S^n, g) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is a harmonic map.*
(b) *For any $x \in S^n$, denote by $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ the singular values of $(f_*)_x : (T_xS^n, g_n) \to (T_{f(x)}S^m, g_m)$, then $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_j^2} = n$.*

Proof. Firstly, we claim Condition (b) has another two equivalent statements as follows:

(c) The energy density of $\mathbf{Id} : (S^n, g) \to (S^n, g_n)$ is $\frac{n}{2}$ everywhere.
(d) The energy density of $f : (S^n, g) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is $\frac{n}{2}$ everywhere.

Now we just give the proof of (b)⇔(c), because the proof of (b)⇔(d) is quite similar. Due to the theory of singular value decomposition, there exists an orthonormal basis $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ of (T_xS^n, g_n), such that

$$\langle f_*\varepsilon_j, f_*\varepsilon_k\rangle = \lambda_j^2\delta_{jk}. \tag{2.8}$$

Now we put

$$e_j := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_j^2}}\varepsilon_j, \tag{2.9}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} g(e_j, e_k) &= \langle (I_{f,\theta})_* e_j, (I_{f,\theta})_* e_k\rangle\\ &= \langle (\cos\theta e_j, \sin\theta f_* e_j), (\cos\theta e_k, \sin\theta f_* e_k)\rangle\\ &= \cos^2\theta\langle e_j, e_k\rangle + \sin^2\theta\langle f_* e_j, f_* e_k\rangle\\ &= \delta_{jk}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

This implies $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of (T_xS^n, g), and moreover

$$2e(\mathbf{Id}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\langle e_j, e_j\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{1}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_j^2}.$$

Therefore Condition (b) is equivalent to (c).

If $I_{f,\theta}$ is a minimal isometric embedding, i.e. $\mathbf{H} = 0$, then(2.7) implies $\tau(\mathbf{Id}) = \tau(f) = 0$ and $e(\mathbf{Id}) = e(f) = \frac{n}{2}$, hence Conditions (a)-(b) hold.

Conversely, once Conditions (a)-(b) hold, substituting $e(\mathbf{Id}) = e(f) = \frac{n}{2}$ and $\tau(f) = 0$ into (2.7) implies $\mathbf{H} = (\cos\theta \cdot \tau(\mathbf{Id}), 0)$. Since $\mathbf{H} \perp (I_{f,\theta})_*(T_x S^n)$,

$$0 = \langle \mathbf{H}, (I_{f,\theta})_* v \rangle = \big\langle (\cos\theta \cdot \tau(\mathbf{Id}), 0), (v, f_* v) \big\rangle = \cos\theta \langle \tau(\mathbf{Id}), v \rangle$$

for every $v \in T_x S^n$. Hence $\tau(\mathbf{Id}) = 0$ and moreover $\mathbf{H} = 0$, i.e., $M_{f,\theta}$ is an LOS in S^{n+m+1}.

□

Remark. From the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can derive a property of LOSs as follows: *If $I_{f,\theta}$ is a minimal isometric embedding, then $\mathbf{Id} : (S^n, g) \to (S^n, g_n)$ is a harmonic map.* This conclusion play an important part in the proof of Corollary 2.1 in the following text.

2.2. **Characterizations of trivial LOMs.** If f is a totally-geodesic isometric embedding from (S^n, g_n) into (S^m, g_m), it is easy to check that $M_{f,\theta}$ is a totally-geodesic subsphere in S^{n+m+1} for arbitrary $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$. In this case, f is called a *trivial LOM*. The following proposition describes characterizations of trivial LOMs from the angle of singular values.

Proposition 2.1. *For any LOM $f : S^n \to S^m$, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *All the singular values of $(f_*)_x$ are equal at any $x \in S^n$.*
(ii) *$f : (S^n, g_n) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is an isometric immersion.*
(iii) *$f : (S^n, g_n) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is a totally-geodesic isometric embedding.*
(iv) *For every $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, $M_{f,\theta}$ is a totally-geodesic LOS.*
(v) *There exists $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, such that $M_{f,\theta}$ is a totally-geodesic LOS.*

Proof. (i)⇒(ii) immediately follows from Condition (b) in Theorem 2.1, (ii)⇒(iii) is a direct corollary of Condition (a) in Theorem 2.1 and the *Gauss equations* (see §1.1 of [47]), and the proof of (iii)⇒(iv)⇒(v)⇒(i) is trivial.

□

Corollary 2.1. *Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be a smooth map, then*

- *If $n \geq 2$ and $m = 1$, then f cannot be an LOM.*
- *If $n \leq 2$ and $m \geq n$, then f is an LOM if and only if f is a trivial LOM.*

Proof. We shall study each cases according the the values of n and m.

Case I. $n = 1$.

In this case, $(f_*)_x$ has one and only one singular value. Hence Proposition 2.1 implies f is an LOM if and only if f is a trivial one.

Case II. $n \geq 2$, $m = 1$.

Denote by $\pi : t \mapsto e^{it}$ the covering map from $\mathbb{R}$ onto S^1, then the lifting theorem in the theory of homotopy implies the existence of the smooth map $\tilde{f} : S^n \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $f = \pi \circ \tilde{f}$. Suppose f be an LOM and $I_{f,\theta}$ be the corresponding minimal embedding from (S^n, g) into (S^{n+2}, g_{n+2}), then by Theorem 2.1, $f : (S^n, g) \to S^1$ is a harmonic map and hence $\tilde{f}$ is a harmonic function on (S^n, g). The strong maximal principle implies $\tilde{f}$ is constant, so does f. Thus all the singular values of $(f_*)_x$ are equal to 0, which causes a contradiction to Proposition 2.1. Hence f cannot be an LOM.

Case III. $n = 2, m \geq 2$.

Suppose f be an LOM and $I_{f,\theta} : (S^2, g) \to (S^{3+m}, g_{3+m})$ be the corresponding minimal isometric embedding, then $\mathbf{Id} : (S^2, g) \to (S^2, g_2)$ and $f : (S^2, g) \to (S^m, g_m)$ are both harmonic maps. Let e_1, e_2 be an orthonormal basis of (T_xS^2, g). Since any harmonic map from a 2-sphere (equipped with an arbitrary metric) has to be conformal (see §I.5 of [39]),

$$\langle e_1, e_1\rangle = \langle e_2, e_2\rangle = e(\mathbf{Id}) = 1, \quad \langle e_1, e_2\rangle = 0$$

and

$$\langle f_*e_1, f_*e_1\rangle = \langle f_*e_2, f_*e_2\rangle = e(f) = 1, \quad \langle f_*e_1, f_*e_2\rangle = 0.$$

Hence $f : (S^2, g_2) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is an isometric immersion. By Proposition 2.1, $f : (S^2, g_2) \to (S^m, g_m)$ has to be a trivial LOM. □

Remarks.

- One of the original LOMs, i.e. the Hopf map from S^3 onto S^2 [30] implies that the limitation of n and m in Corollary 2.1 is necessary and optimal.
- For each LOM f, the corresponding LOC $C_{f,\theta}$ is an $(n+1)$-dimensional non-parametric minimal cone in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$, which is flat if and only if f is trivial. Hence the second part of the above corollary can be deduced from the rigidity theorems in [10], [2] and [19], claiming that any non-parametric minimal cone of dimension three or less has to be flat. On the other hand, it is unknown up to now whether or not there exists a nonflat, non-parametric minimal cone of codimension 2, so the first part of Corollary 2.1 cannot be deduced from existing conclusions.

2.3. **Nontrivial LOMs whose nonzero singular values are equal.** It is well-known that all three types of original LOMs $H^{2m-1,m} : (S^{2m-1}, g_{2m-1}) \to (S^m, \frac{1}{4}g_m)$ with $m = 2, 4$ or 8 are all Riemannian submersions, which implies $H^{2m-1,m} : (S^{2m-1}, g_{2m-1}) \to (S^m, g_m)$ has two constant singular values, 0 and 2, and the multiplicity of 2 is always m. This observation motives us to study nontrivial LOMs whose nonzero singular values are equal (LOMSEs).

Theorem 2.2. *For a smooth mapping f from S^n to S^m, the following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *f is a nontrivial LOM, and for any $x \in S^n$, all the nonzero singular values of $(f_*)_x$ are equal.*
(ii) *f is a LOM, and $f : (S^n, g_n) \to (S^n, g_m)$ has two constant singular values 0 and $\lambda > 0$, whose multiplicities are respectively $(n-p)$ and p everywhere.*
(iii) *There exist a p-dimensional Riemannian manifold (P, h) with $p < n$, a real number $\lambda > \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}$, a map π from S^n onto P and a map i from P into S^m, such that $f = i \circ \pi$, $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$ is a harmonic Riemannian submersion with connected fibers, and $i : (P, h) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion.*

An LOM f satisfying any one of the above conditions is called an LOMSE, and $M_{f,\theta}$ is an LOS associated to f if and only if

$$\theta = \arccos \sqrt{\frac{n-p}{n(1-\lambda^{-2})}}. \tag{2.11}$$

The proof of this theorem relies on the following two lemmas.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $(\bar{N}^n, \bar{g}), (N^m, g)$ be Riemannian manifolds and $\bar{N}$ is compact. $\phi : (\bar{N}, \bar{g}) \to (N, g)$ is a smooth map with two constant singular values, 0 and 1, multiplicities of which are $(n-p)$ and p, respectively. Then there exists a Riemannian manifold (P^p, h), a Riemannian submersion $\pi : (\bar{N}, \bar{g}) \to (P, h)$ whose fibers are all connected, and an isometric immersion $i : (P, h) \to (N, g)$, such that $\phi = i \circ \pi$.*

The proof of Lemma 2.1 is a bit subtle and has little relationship with the other parts of this paper, we left it in Appendix §4.1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{K_\alpha : \alpha \in \Lambda\}$ be a d-dimensional foliation of a manifold M^n, where Λ is an index set. Suppose $g, \tilde{g}$ be two Riemannian metrics of M, satisfying:*

(a) *There exists a positive constant μ, such that $\tilde{g}|_{K_\alpha} = \mu g|_{K_\alpha}$ for every $\alpha \in \Lambda$;*
(b) *For each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, $p \in K_\alpha$ and any $v \in T_p M$, $w \in T_p K_\alpha$, $\tilde{g}(v, w) = 0$ if and only if $g(v, w) = 0$.*

Then for any $\alpha \in \Lambda$, K_α is a minimal submanifold in $(M, \tilde{g})$ if and only K_α is a minimal submanifold in (M, g), where K_α is equipped with the induced Riemannian metrics for each case.

Proof. Let ∇ be the Levi-Civita connection with respect to g, then a straightforward calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} g(\nabla_X Y, Z) =& \frac{1}{2}\Big\{ \nabla_X g(Y, Z) + \nabla_Y g(Z, X) - \nabla_Z g(X, Y) \\ &+ g(Y, [Z, X]) + g(Z, [X, Y]) - g(X, [Y, Z]) \Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

for any vector fields X, Y, Z on M (see e.g. §1 of [45]).

Denote by B the second fundamental form of K_α in (M, g) and by $\mathbf{H}$ the mean vector field, then

(2.13)
$$\begin{aligned} g(\mathbf{H}, \nu) &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} g(B(E_i, E_i), \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} g(\nabla_{E_i} E_i, \nu) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} \frac{1}{2}\Big\{2\nabla_{E_i} g(E_i, \nu) - \nabla_\nu g(E_i, E_i) + 2g(E_i, [\nu, E_i]) + g(\nu, [E_i, E_i])\Big\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} g(E_i, [\nu, E_i]). \end{aligned}$$

Here $\{E_1, \cdots, E_n\}$ is a tangent frame field on an open domain $U \subset M$, such that for any $x \in U$, $\{E_1(x), \cdots, E_d(x)\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $(T_x K_\beta, g)$, with K_β the unique leaf going though x, and ν is a vector field on U that is orthogonal to each leaves.

Similarly, denote by $\tilde{B}$ the second fundamental form of K_α in $(M, \tilde{g})$ and by $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ the mean vector field. Observing that $\tilde{g}(E_i, E_j) = \mu g(E_i, E_j) = \mu\delta_{ij}$, one computes that

(2.14)
$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}(\tilde{\mathbf{H}}, \nu) &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mu^{-1} \tilde{g}(\tilde{B}(E_i, E_i), \nu) = \mu^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \tilde{g}(E_i, [\nu, E_i]) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{d} g(E_i, [\nu, E_i]). \end{aligned}$$

Since ν is arbitrary, $\mathbf{H} = 0$ if and only if $\tilde{\mathbf{H}} = 0$. □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOM and $M_{f,\theta}$ be the associated LOS in S^{n+m+1}. Let 0 and $\lambda > 0$ be the singular values of $(f_*)_x$, whose multiplicities are $(n-p)$ and p, respectively. Then Condition (b) of Theorem 2.1 gives

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{n\cos^2\theta}{p - n\sin^2\theta}} \in \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}, +\infty\right). \tag{2.15}$$

Note that λ is continuously depending on x, both λ and p have to be constant on S^n. Thereby (i)⇒(ii) has been proved. And (2.11) immediately follows from (2.15).

(ii) implies $f : (S^n, g_n) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ has 2 constant singular values 0 and 1, whose multiplicities are $(n-p)$ and p, respectively. By Lemma 2.1, there exists a Riemannian manifold (P^p, h), a Riemannian submersion $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$ whose fibers are all connected and an isometric immersion $i : (P, h) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$, such that $f = i \circ \pi$. To deduce (iii), it suffices to show both π and i are harmonic maps.

By Condition (a) of Theorem 2.1, $f : (S^n, g) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is a harmonic map. Hence $f : (S^n, g) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is also harmonic and the composition formula

yields

$$0 = \tau(f) = \tau(i \circ \pi) = \tau(\pi) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B(\pi_* e_j, \pi_* e_j),$$

where $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ is an arbitrary orthonormal basis of the tangent plane of (S^n, g) at the considered point and B is the second fundamental form of (P, h) as an immersed submanifold of $(S^m, \lambda^{-1} g_m)$. Observing that $\tau(\pi)$ (or $\sum_{j=1}^{n} B(\pi_* e_j, \pi_* e_j)$) can be viewed as a tangent (normal) vector on P, one concludes that $\pi : (S^n, g) \to (P, h)$ is harmonic, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} B(\pi_* e_j, \pi_* e_j) = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

By putting $\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_p = \lambda$ and $\lambda_{p+1} = \cdots = \lambda_n = 0$, one can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, to choose an orthonormal basis $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ of $(T_x S^n, g_n)$ according to the singular value decomposition and get the corresponding orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ of $(T_x S^n, g)$, see (2.9). Thereby, $f = i \circ \pi$ implies $\{\pi_* \varepsilon_1, \cdots, \pi_* \varepsilon_p\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $(T_{\pi(x)} P, h)$ and $\pi_* \varepsilon_i = 0$ for every $p + 1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e. $\{\varepsilon_{p+1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ is a basis of the tangent space of the fiber of π passing through x. Substituting (2.9) into (2.16) yields $\sum_{j=1}^{p} B(\pi_* \varepsilon_j, \pi_* \varepsilon_j) = 0$ and hence $i : (P, h) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion.

Based on (2.9), one can check that both $\pi : (S^n, g) \to (P, \mu^2 h)$ with $\mu := (\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta \lambda^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$ are both Riemannian submersions, where the former one is harmonic. It is well-known that a Riemannian submersion from a Riemannian manifold M is harmonic if and only if all fibers are minimal submanifolds of M (see Proposition 1.12 of [16]). Therefore, to prove the harmonicity of $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$, it suffices to show that the minimality of each fiber of π in (S^n, g) implies the minimality of the same one in (S^n, g_n). This fact directly follows from Lemma 2.2, since it is easy to check that g and g_n satisfy Conditions (a)-(b) of the lemma. And the proof of (ii)⇒(iii) is completed.

Finally, the proof of (iii)⇒(i) is quite similar to the proof of (ii)⇒(iii), where the crucial step is showing that the minimality of each fiber of π in (S^n, g_n) also implies the minimality of the same one in (S^n, g) with the aid of Lemma 2.2.

□

2.4. **LOMSEs of (n,p,k)-type.** Furthermore, in conjunction with Theorem 2.2 and the spectrum theory of Laplacian operators, one can deduce the following properties of LOMSEs.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOMSE, denote by λ the nonzero singular value and p the multiplicity of λ (i.e. $p = rank(f_*)_x$ for every $x \in S^n$), then there exists an integer $k \geq 2$, such that:*

- *For every $x \in S^n$, denote by $(f_1(x), \cdots, f_{m+1}(x))$ the position vector of $f(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, then $f_1, \cdots, f_{m+1}$ are all spherical harmonic functions of degree k.*
- $\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k(k+n-1)}{p}}$.
- *$M_{f,\theta}$ is an LOS associated to f if and only if*

$$\theta = \arccos \sqrt{\frac{1 - \frac{p}{n}}{1 - \frac{p}{k(k+n-1)}}}. \tag{2.17}$$

In this case, f is said to be an LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, there exists a Riemannian manifold (P^p, h), $\pi : S^n \to P$ and $i : P \to S^m$, such that $f = i \circ \pi$, $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$ is a harmonic Riemannian submersion and $i : (P, h) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion.

For any $y \in P$, denote $\mathbf{Y}(y)$ to be the position vector of $i(y)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, then $\mathbf{Y} = i_m \circ \mathbf{Id} \circ i$ with $\mathbf{Id}$ the identity map from $(S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ onto (S^m, g_m). Since i is a minimal isometric immersion and $\mathbf{Id}$ is a totally geodesic map, $\tau(\mathbf{Id} \circ i) = 0$ and the composition formula implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_h(\mathbf{Y}) &= \tau(\mathbf{Y}) = \tau(i_m \circ \mathbf{Id} \circ i) \\ &= \tau(\mathbf{Id} \circ i) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} B_m\left((\mathbf{Id} \circ i)_* e_j, (\mathbf{Id} \circ i)_* e_j\right) \\ &= -\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \langle (\mathbf{Id} \circ i)_* e_j, (\mathbf{Id} \circ i)_* e_j \rangle\right) \mathbf{Y} = -\left(\sum_{j=1}^{p} \lambda^2 h(e_j, e_j)\right) \mathbf{Y} \\ &= -\lambda^2 p \cdot \mathbf{Y}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

Here $\{e_1, \cdots, e_p\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(T_y P, h)$.

On the other hand, $\mathbf{Y}(y)$ can be written as $(h_1(y), \cdots, h_{m+1}(y))$, then (2.18) equals to saying that

$$\Delta_h(h_j) = -\lambda^2 p \cdot h_j. \tag{2.19}$$

In conjunction with the composition formula, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{g_n}(h_j \circ \pi) = \tau(h_j \circ \pi) &= (h_j)_*(\tau(\pi)) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} B_{\pi_* \varepsilon_j, \pi_* \varepsilon_j}(h_j) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathrm{Hess}_h(h_j)(\pi_* \varepsilon_j, \pi_* \varepsilon_j) = \Delta_h(h_j) \circ \pi \\ &= -\lambda^2 p (h_j \circ \pi), \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(T_x S^n, g_n)$, such that $\{\pi_* \varepsilon_1, \cdots, \pi_* \varepsilon_p\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $(T_{\pi(x)} P, h)$, and $\pi_* \varepsilon_{p+1} = \cdots = \pi_* \varepsilon_n = 0$. In other words,

$$\Delta_{g_n} f_j = -\lambda^2 p \cdot f_j \qquad \forall 1 \le j \le m+1. \tag{2.21}$$

By the theory of eigenvalues of the Laplacian on Euclidean spheres, there exists a positive integer k, such that $\lambda^2 p = k(k+n-1)$ and f_j is a spherical harmonic function of degree k (see §II.4 of [9]). This equals to saying that

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k(k+n-1)}{p}}. \tag{2.22}$$

And $\lambda > \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}$ forces $k \geq 2$. Finally, substituting (2.22) into (2.11) gives (2.17).

□

Based on Theorem 2.4, one can calculate several geometric quantities of LOSs or LOCs associated to LOMSEs of (n,p,k)-type, which only depend on the values of (n,p,k). See Appendix §4.2 for the details of calculation.

Corollary 2.2. *Let f be an LOMSE of (n,p,k)-type, $M_{f,\theta}$ and $C_{f,\theta}$ be the corresponding LOS and LOC, respectively, then:*

(A) *All normal planes of $M_{f,\theta}$ make a constant acute angle $\alpha_{n,p,k}$ to a fixed reference plane, where*

$$\cos\alpha_{n,p,k} = \sqrt{\frac{1-\frac{p}{n}}{1-\frac{p}{k(k+n-1)}}} \cdot \left(\frac{n-p}{k(k+n-1)-p}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \tag{2.23}$$

(B) *The volume of $M_{f,\theta}$ is*

$$V_{n,p,k} = \left(\frac{k(k+n-1)}{n}\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} \left(\frac{1-\frac{p}{n}}{1-\frac{p}{k(k+n-1)}}\right)^{\frac{n-p}{2}} \omega_n \tag{2.24}$$

with ω_n the volume of n-dimensional Euclidean sphere.

(C) *$C_{f,\theta}$ is an entire minimal graph with constant Jordan angles relative to a fixed reference plane. The tangent Jordan angles of $C_{f,\theta}$ are*

$$\arccos\sqrt{\frac{n-p}{k(k+n-1)-p}}, \arccos\sqrt{\frac{1-\frac{p}{n}}{1-\frac{p}{k(k+n-1)}}}, 0, \tag{2.25}$$

whose multiplicities are $p, 1, n-p$, respectively. The slope function of $C_{f,\theta}$ is identically equal to $W_{n,p,k} = \sec\alpha_{n,p,k}$.

Remarks.

- According to Theorem 2.4 and Corollary 2.2, the three types of original LOMs are LOMSEs of $(2m-1, 2m, 2)$-type, with $m = 2, 4$ or 8, which are all compact minimal submanifolds in spheres whose normal planes make a constant acute angle with a fixed reference plane, and these angles are respectively $\alpha_{3,2,2}$, $\alpha_{7,4,2}$ and $\alpha_{15,8,2}$, satisfying $\cos\alpha_{3,2,2} = \frac{1}{9}$, $\cos\alpha_{7,4,2} = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{7}}$ and $\cos\alpha_{15,8,2} = 7^4 \cdot 2^{-11} \cdot 3^{-5}\sqrt{\frac{7}{5}}$. This fact has been discovered by Lawson-Osserman [30], so (A) reveals a universal property for a wider class of compact minimal submanifolds in spheres, in a more general scheme.

- It was shown by E. Calabi [7] that the area of all minimal surfaces in spheres that is homeomorphic to S^2 has to be an integral of 2π. For higher dimensional cases, the existence of the gap between the volume of the totally geodesic subsphere and the volumes of other compact minimal submanifolds in spheres was discovered by Cheng-Li-Yau [11]. It is natural for us to ask whether the volumes of compact minimal submanifolds in a Euclidean sphere take values in a discrete set. Besides the work of Perdomo-Wei [36] on minimal rotational hypersurfaces, (B) gives a positive evidence to support this conjecture from another viewpoint.
- The *Jordan angles* between two d_2-planes P and Q in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$ are the critical values of the angles between the nonzero vectors u in P and their orthogonal projection u^* in Q. This concept was firstly introduced by C. Jordan [24]. Given a submanifold M^{d_1} in $\mathbb{R}^{d_1+d_2}$, if the Jordan angles between all normal planes of M and a fixed reference plane are constant, M is called a *submanifold with constant Jordan angles (CJA)* (see [29]). (C) tells us, although we can construct uncountable many LOCs corresponding to LOMSEs (see the following text of the present subsection), which are all submanifolds of CJA, but the constant slope functions of them take values in a discrete set. This gives a partial positive answer to Problem 1.1 in [29].

Let $f_1 : S^{n_1} \to S^{m_1}$, $f_2 : S^{n_2} \to S^{m_2}$ be nontrivial LOMs. Without loss of generality one can assume $m_1 \leq m_2$. If $n_1 = n_2 = n$, and there exist $\chi : S^n \to S^n$, $\psi : S^{m_1} \to S^{m_2}$, such that $\chi : (S^n, g_n) \to (S^n, g_n)$ is an isometry, $\psi : (S^{m_1}, g_{m_1}) \to (S^{m_2}, g_{m_2})$ is a totally geodesic isometric embedding, and the following commutative diagram holds,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^n & \xrightarrow{\chi} & S^n \\ {\scriptstyle f_1}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} \\ S^{m_1} & \xrightarrow{\psi} & S^{m_2} \end{array}$$

then f_1 and f_2 is said to be *equivalent*. In conjunction with the existing structure theorems on Riemannian submersions from Euclidean spheres and minimal immersions into Euclidean spheres, we arrive at a classification theorem of LOMSEs as follows.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}_{n,p,k}$ be the set of all equivalence classes of (n,p,k)-type LOMSEs. Then, $\mathcal{F}_{n,p,k}$ is nonempty if and only if k is an even positive integer, and $(n,p) = (15,8)$, $(2l+1, 2l)$ or $(4l+3, 4l)$ for some positive integer l. Moreover, we have*

- *If $(n,p) = (2l+1, 2l)$, there exists a $1:1$ correspondence between $\mathcal{F}_{2l+1,2l,k}$ and the set of equivalence classes of full isometric minimal immersions of $(\mathbb{CP}^l, \frac{k(k+2l)}{8l} g_{FS})$ into unit Euclidean spheres, where g_{FS} is the Fubini-Study metric.*
- *If $(n,p) = (4l+3, 4l)$, there exists a $1:1$ correspondence between $\mathcal{F}_{4l+1,4l,k}$ and the set of equivalence classes of full isometric minimal immersions of $(\mathbb{HP}^l, \frac{k(k+4l+2)}{16l} g_{ST})$ into unit Euclidean spheres, where g_{ST} is the standard metric on $\mathbb{HP}^l$.*

- *If $(n,p)=(15,8)$, there exists a $1:1$ correspondence between $\mathcal{F}_{15,8,k}$ and the set of equivalence classes of full isometric minimal immersions of $(S^8,\frac{k(k+14)}{32}g_8)$ into unit Euclidean spheres.*

Remarks.

- An immersion $i:P\to S^m\subset\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ is said to be *full* if $i(P)$ is not contained in a hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$, and two immersions are said to be *equivalent* if they differ by an isometry of S^m, see [8].
- The *standard metric* on $\mathbb{HP}^l$ is an analog of the Fubini-Study metric on $\mathbb{CP}^l$, see §3.2 of [6] for details.

Proof. By Theorem 2.2, an LOMSE f can be written as $f=i\circ\pi$, where $\pi:(S^n,g_n)\longrightarrow(P,h)$ is a harmonic Riemannian submersion whose fibers are all connected and $i:(P,\lambda^2 h)\longrightarrow(S^m,g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion. B. Wilking's [43] classification theorem tells us that Riemannian submersions from Euclidean spheres with connected fibers are just the Hopf fibrations, including $H^{2l+1,2l}:(S^{2l+1},g_{2l+1})\longrightarrow(\mathbb{CP}^l,\frac{1}{4}g_{FS})$, $H^{4l+3,4l}:(S^{4l+3},g_{4l+3})\longrightarrow(\mathbb{HP}^l,\frac{1}{4}g_{ST})$ and $H^{15,8}:(S^{15},g_{15})\longrightarrow(S^8,\frac{1}{4}g_8)$, which are all harmonic. Therefore, the set of all equivalence classes of (n,p,k)-type LOMSEs corresponds to the set of equivalence classes of full isometric minimal immersions from $(\mathbb{CP}^l,\frac{k(k+2l)}{8l}g_{FS})$ (when $(n,p)=(2l+1,2l)$), $(\mathbb{HP}^l,\frac{k(k+4l+2)}{16l}g_{ST})$ (when $(n,p)=(4l+3,4l)$) or $(S^8,\frac{k(k+14)}{32}g_8)$ (when $(n,p)=(15,8)$), into (S^m,g_m). This is a corollary of Theorem 2.3.

Denote by $V_{n,p,k}$ the eigenspace of Laplace-Beltrami operator on (P,h) ($P=\mathbb{CP}^l,\mathbb{HP}^l$ or S^8), such that for any $\phi\in V_{n,p,k}$, $\phi\circ\pi$ is a spherical harmonic function or order k, on S^n. By Theorem 2.3, each components of the position vector function of i, i.e. $h_1,\cdots,h_{m+1}$, are all nonzero functions in $V_{n,p,k}$. Noting that $\pi(x)=\pi(-x)$, $f_j=h_j\circ\pi$ takes the same value on each pair of antipodal points, forcing k to be even.

On the other hand, one can prove $\mathcal{F}_{n,p,k}\neq\emptyset$ whenever $(n,p)=(2l+1,2l),(4l+3,4l)$ or $(15,8)$ and k is even. Firstly, due to the classical spectral theory of Euclidean spheres, complex projective spaces and quaternionic projective spaces (see e.g. §III.C of [3] for details), $V_{n,p,k}\neq(0)$. Let $m=m_{n,p,k}:=\dim V_{n,p,k}-1$ and $\{h_1,\cdots,h_{m+1}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $V_{n,p,k}$ with respect to the inner product

$$(\varphi,\psi)=\int_P\varphi\psi d\mu,$$

where $d\mu$ is proportional to the volume element of P and normalized so that $\int_P d\mu=m+1$, then it is easy to check that $\sum_{j=1}^{m+1}h_j^2=1$. Denote $i:P\to S^m$

$$y\in P\mapsto(h_1(y),\cdots,h_{m+1}(y)),$$

then one can prove i is a full isometric minimal immersion from (P,i^*g_m) into S^m, and i^*g_m is proportional to h. This is called the *standard minimal immersion*, see [8][41]. Theorem 2.2 and 2.3 ensure $f:=i\circ\pi$ be an (n,p,k)-type LOMSE, which is

called the *standard LOMSE of* (n, p, k)*-type*. This complete the proof of the present theorem.

□

Examples and Remarks.

- It is easy to check that, *the Hopf fibration from* S^{2m-1} *onto* S^m *is the standard LOMSE of* $(2m-1, m, 2)$*-type, where* $m = 2, 4$ *or* 8.
- By identifying S^5 with the subset of all (z_1, z_2, z_3) in $\mathbb{C}^3$, such that $|z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2 = 1$, the Hopf fibration from S^5 onto $\mathbb{CP}^2$ can be written as

$$H^{5,4} : (z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto [(z_1, z_2, z_3)].$$

Via $H^{5,4}$, any function on $\mathbb{CP}^2$ corresponds to a unique $U(1)$-invariant function on S^5, and vice versa. Let

$$\begin{aligned} &f_1 = |z_1|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(|z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2), \quad f_2 = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(|z_2|^2 - |z_3|^2), \\ &f_3 = \mathbf{Re}(\sqrt{3}z_1\bar{z}_2), \quad f_4 = \mathbf{Im}(\sqrt{3}z_1\bar{z}_2), \quad f_5 = \mathbf{Re}(\sqrt{3}z_2\bar{z}_3), \\ &f_6 = \mathbf{Im}(\sqrt{3}z_2\bar{z}_3), \quad f_7 = \mathbf{Re}(\sqrt{3}z_3\bar{z}_1), \quad f_8 = \mathbf{Im}(\sqrt{3}z_3\bar{z}_1) \end{aligned}$$

be $U(1)$-invariant spherical harmonic functions of order 2, and h_j $(1 \le j \le 8)$ be the function on $\mathbb{CP}^2$ such that $f_j = h_j \circ \pi$, then a careful calculation shows $\{h_1, \cdots, h_8\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $V_{5,4,2}$, see [49] for details. This concludes that $f := (f_1, \cdots, f_8) : S^5 \to S^7$ is *the standard LOMSE of* $(5, 4, 2)$*-type*. As a matter of convenience, f can be written as

$$f = (|z_1|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(|z_2|^2 + |z_3|^2), \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(|z_2|^2 - |z_3|^2), \sqrt{3}z_1\bar{z}_2, \sqrt{3}z_2\bar{z}_3, \sqrt{3}z_3\bar{z}_1).$$

- Similarly to above, one can prove $f : S^{11} \to S^{13}$

$$f = (|q_1|^2 - \frac{1}{2}(|q_2|^2 + |q_3|^2), \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}(|q_2|^2 - |q_3|^2), \sqrt{3}q_1\bar{q}_2, \sqrt{3}q_2\bar{q}_3, \sqrt{3}q_3\bar{q}_1)$$

is *the standard LOMSE of* $(11, 8, 2)$*-type*. Here S^{11} is identified with the subset of all (q_1, q_2, q_3) in $\mathbb{H}^3$, such that $|q_1|^2 + |q_2|^2 + |q_3|^2 = 1$. See [49] for details of proof.
- In conjunction with the structure theorem for minimal immersions from symmetric spaces into spheres done by do Carmo-Wallach [8] and Theorem 2.4, the moduli space $\mathcal{F}_{n,p,k}$ can be smoothly parameterized by a convex body L in a vector space W_2. If $\dim W_2 = 0$, then an LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type has to be the standard one; otherwise, one can find uncountable many LOMSEs of (n, p, k)-type. Still, it is quite difficulty to calculate $\dim W_2$, we can only give partial answers for several particular cases:
  - If $k = 2$, any LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type is equivalent to the standard one. (This conclusion follows from the rigidity theorems for minimal immersions into spheres, gotten by N. Wallach [42] and K. Mashimo [31][32].)

- If $(n,p)=(7,4)$ or $(15,8)$ and $k\leq 6$, any LOMSE of (n,p,k)-type has to the standard one. (This conclusion follows from the works of E. Calabi [7] and do Carmo-Wallach [8].)
- If $(n,p)=(7,4)$ or $(15,8)$ and $k\geq 8$, then $\dim W_2\geq 18$ (see [8]).
- If $(n,p)=(2l+1,2l)$ with $l\geq 2$ and $k\geq 8$, then $\dim W_2\geq 91$ (see [41] by H. Urakawa).
- If $(n,p)=(11,8)$ and $k\geq 8$, then $\dim W_2\geq 29007$ (see [41]).

3. On Dirichlet problems related to LOMSEs

3.1. **Necessary and sufficient conditions for minimal graphs.** Let f be a smooth mapping from S^n into S^m, ρ be a smooth function on an open interval $U\subset(0,\infty)$, and $M_{f,\rho}$ be an embedded submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$ written in the form of (1.7). Denote by g the pull-back metric on $M_{f,\rho}$. For an arbitrary $r\in U$, let I_r be an embedding from S^n into M defined by

$$x\mapsto(rx,\rho(r)f(x)) \tag{3.1}$$

and let h_r be the pull-back metric on S^n, then (S^n,h_r) is an embedded Riemannian submanifold of $(M_{f,\rho},g)$. Note that both $(rx,\rho(r)f(x))\mapsto r$ and $(rx,\rho(r)f(x))\mapsto\rho(r)$ are smooth functions on $M_{f,\rho}$, which are respectively denoted by r and ρ in the cases causing no confusions. Obviously r and ρ are constant functions on $I_{r_0}(S^n)$ and hence $\nabla_v r=\nabla_v\rho=0$ for any v that is tangent to $I_{r_0}(S^n)$.

The following theorem reveals the necessary and sufficient conditions forcing $M_{f,\rho}$ to be minimal.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $f:S^n\to S^m$ and ρ be a smooth positive function on $U\subset(0,\infty)$, then $(M_{f,\rho},g)$ is an embedded minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$ if and only if the following two conditions hold:*

(a) *$f:(S^n,h_r)\to(S^m,g_m)$ is a harmonic map for any $r\in U$.*
(b) *$\Delta_g\rho-2\rho\cdot e(f)=0$ at $I_r(x)\in M$ for each $r\in U$ and $x\in S^n$, where $e(f)$ is the energy density of $f:(S^n,h_r)\to(S^m,g_m)$ at x.*

Condition (b) has an equivalent statement as follows: For any $x\in S^n$, denote by $\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_n$ the singular values of $(f_*)_x:(T_xS^n,g_n)\to(T_{f(x)}S^m,g_m)$, then

$$\frac{\rho_{rr}}{1+\rho_r^2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n}\frac{\frac{\rho_r}{r}-\frac{\lambda_i^2\rho}{r^2}}{1+\frac{\lambda_i^2\rho^2}{r^2}}=0. \tag{3.2}$$

Proof. Denote $\mathbf{X}:U\times S^n\to\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$

$$(r,x)\mapsto(r\mathbf{Y}_1(x),\rho(r)\mathbf{Y}_2(x))$$

with $\mathbf{Y}_1(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and $\mathbf{Y}_2(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ the position vectors of x and $f(x)$, respectively, then $\mathbf{X}$ can be viewed as the position function of $M_{f,\rho}$. The tangent plane at $\mathbf{X}(r,x)$ is spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ and E_i $(1 \le i \le n)$, where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} := \mathbf{X}_r = (\mathbf{Y}_1(x), \rho_r \mathbf{Y}_2(x))$$

and

$$E_i := \nabla_{e_i} \mathbf{X} = (re_i, \rho(r) f_* e_i)$$

with $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ a basis of $T_x S^n$. A direct calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, E_i \rangle &= \big\langle (\mathbf{Y}_1(x), \rho_r \mathbf{Y}_2(x)), (re_i, \rho(r) f_* e_i) \big\rangle \\ &= r \langle \mathbf{Y}_1(x), e_i \rangle + \rho_r \rho \langle \mathbf{Y}_2(x), f_* e_i \rangle = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \rangle = 1 + \rho_r^2. \tag{3.4}$$

$(r,x) \mapsto \mathbf{Y}_2(x)$ can be viewed as a vector-valued function on $(M_{f,\rho}, g)$, which is independent of r. Thus

$$\text{Hess } \mathbf{Y}_2(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \mathbf{Y}_2 - (\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) \mathbf{Y}_2 = -(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) \mathbf{Y}_2$$

with ∇ denoting the Levi-Civita connection on $(M_{f,\rho}, g)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, E_i \rangle &= \langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} (\mathbf{Y}_1(x), \rho_r \mathbf{Y}_2(x)), E_i \rangle \\ &= \big\langle (0, \rho_{rr} \mathbf{Y}_2(x)), (re_i, \rho(r) f_* e_i) \big\rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for each $1 \le i \le n$, $\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ is parallel to $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ and hence $(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) \mathbf{Y}_2 = 0$. Therefore Hess $\mathbf{Y}_2(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = 0$. Moreover, noting that (S^n, h_r) is a Riemannian submanifold of $(M_{f,\rho}, g)$, we have

$$\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_2 = \Delta_{h_r} \mathbf{Y}_2 + \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \rangle^{-1} \text{Hess } \mathbf{Y}_2(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = \Delta_{h_r} \mathbf{Y}_2. \tag{3.5}$$

Restricted on (S^n, h_r), the vector-valued function $\mathbf{Y}_2$ can be written in the form $\mathbf{Y}_2 = i_m \circ f$, as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Using the composition formula for tension fields, one can proceed as in (2.5) to get

$$\Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_2 = \Delta_{h_r} \mathbf{Y}_2 = \tau(\mathbf{Y}_2) = \tau(f) - 2e(f)\mathbf{Y}_2. \tag{3.6}$$

Let $\mathbf{H}$ denote the mean curvature vector field on $M_{f,\rho}$, then

$$\mathbf{H} = \Delta_g \mathbf{X} = (\Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), \Delta_g(\rho(r)\mathbf{Y}_2)). \tag{3.7}$$

If $M_{f,\rho}$ is a minimal submanifold, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \Delta_g(\rho(r)\mathbf{Y}_2) \\ &= (\Delta_g \rho)\mathbf{Y}_2 + \rho \Delta_g \mathbf{Y}_2 + 2\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \rangle^{-1} \rho_r \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} \mathbf{Y}_2 + \sum_{i,j} g^{ij} \nabla_{E_i} \rho \nabla_{E_j} \mathbf{Y}_2 \\ &= \rho \cdot \tau(f) + (\Delta_g \rho - 2\rho \cdot e(f))\mathbf{Y}_2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where (g^{ij}) is the inverse matrix of $(g_{ij}) := \big(\langle E_i, E_j\rangle\big)$. It follows that $\tau(f) = \Delta_g\rho - 2\rho\cdot e(f) = 0$.

Conversely, $\tau(f) = \Delta_g\rho - 2\rho\cdot e(f) = 0$ implies $\mathbf{H} = (\Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), 0)$. Since $\mathbf{H}$ is orthogonal to the tangent space at each point of $M_{f,\rho}$,

$$0 = \langle \mathbf{H}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle = \big\langle (\Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), 0), (\mathbf{Y}_1, \rho_r\mathbf{Y}_2)\big\rangle = \langle \Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), \mathbf{Y}_1\rangle$$

and

$$0 = \langle \mathbf{H}, E_i\rangle = \big\langle (\Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), 0), (re_i, \rho f_* e_i)\big\rangle = r\langle \Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1), e_i\rangle$$

for every $1 \le i \le n$, which imply $\Delta_g(r\mathbf{Y}_1) = 0$ and hence $\mathbf{H} = 0$, i.e. $M_{f,\rho}$ is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$. Therefore, Conditions (a)-(b) are the necessary and sufficient conditions ensuring $M_{f,\rho}$ is minimal.

To show the equivalence of Condition (b) and (3.2), we shall calculate $e(f)$ and $\Delta_g\rho$ in the following text.

Now we choose $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ to be an orthonormal basis of (T_xS^n, g_n), such that $\langle f_*e_i, f_*e_j\rangle = \lambda_i^2\delta_{ij}$, then

$$\langle E_i, E_j\rangle = \langle (re_i, \rho_r f_* e_i), (re_j, \rho f_* e_j)\rangle = (r^2 + \rho^2\lambda_i^2)\delta_{ij} \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$2e(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle f_*e_i, f_*e_i\rangle}{h_r(e_i, e_i)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle f_*e_i, f_*e_i\rangle}{\langle E_i, E_i\rangle} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_i^2}{r^2 + \rho^2\lambda_i^2}. \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand, the composition formula implies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_g\rho(r) &= \rho_r\Delta_g r + \rho_{rr}|\mathrm{grad}_g r|^2 \\ &= \rho_r\left(\frac{\mathrm{Hess}_g r(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r})}{\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathrm{Hess}_g r(E_i, E_i)}{\langle E_i, E_i\rangle}\right) + \rho_{rr}|\mathrm{grad}_g r|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

with Hess_g and grad_g denoting the Hessian operator and the gradient operator with respect to g, respectively. A straightforward calculation shows

$$|\mathrm{grad}_g r|^2 = \langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle^{-1} = \frac{1}{1+\rho_r^2}, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Hess}_g r(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}} dr(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}) - dr(\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}) \\ &= -\frac{\langle \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle}{\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle} dr(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = -\frac{\nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial r}}\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle}{2\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle} \\ &= -\frac{(1+\rho_r^2)_r}{2(1+\rho_r^2)} = -\frac{\rho_r\rho_{rr}}{1+\rho_r^2} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Hess}_g r(E_i,E_i) = \nabla_{E_i} dr(E_i) - dr(\nabla_{E_i}E_i)\\
=&-\frac{\langle \nabla_{E_i}E_i, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle}{\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle} dr(\frac{\partial}{\partial r}) = \frac{\langle \nabla_{E_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}, E_i\rangle}{\langle \frac{\partial}{\partial r}, \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\rangle}\\
=&\frac{\langle (e_i, \rho_r f_* e_i), (re_i, \rho f_* e_i)\rangle}{1+\rho_r^2} = \frac{r+\rho\rho_r\lambda_i^2}{1+\rho_r^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Substituting (3.12)-(3.14) and (3.4) into (3.11) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_g \rho =& -\frac{\rho_r^2\rho_{rr}}{(1+\rho_r^2)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho_r(r+\rho\rho_r\lambda_i^2)}{(1+\rho_r^2)(r^2+\rho^2\lambda_i^2)} + \frac{\rho_{rr}}{1+\rho_r^2}\\
=& \frac{\rho_{rr}}{(1+\rho_r^2)^2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\rho_r(r+\rho\rho_r\lambda_i^2)}{(1+\rho_r^2)(r^2+\rho^2\lambda_i^2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

In conjunction of (3.10) and (3.15), Condition (b) is equivalent to (3.2).

□

Remark. Let $\rho : U \to \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function so that $M_{f,\rho}$ is a minimal submanifold (here we do not assume $\rho > 0$). Denote Z to be the set consisting of all zeros points of ρ, then (3.8) implies $f : (S^n, h_r) \to (S^m, g_m)$ is harmonic for every $r \notin Z$. If Z has at least 1 interior point, the analyticity of ρ^2 forces $\rho \equiv 0$. Otherwise, since the tension field is smoothly depending on the metric, $f : (S^n, h_r) \to (S^m, g_m)$ should be a harmonic map for any $r \in Z$. Therefore, the condition 'ρ is positive' of Theorem 3.1 can be replaced by 'ρ is not identically zero'.

3.2. **Entire minimal graphs associated to LOMSEs.** Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOMSE of (n,p,k)-type, then by Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3,

$$\lambda = \sqrt{\frac{k(k+n-1)}{p}} \tag{3.16}$$

is the nonzero singular value of f_* at each point, and f is the composition of $\pi : S^n \to P$ and $i : P \to S^m$, such that $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$ is a harmonic Riemannian submersion and $i : (P, h) \to (S^m, \lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion.

For any $x \in S^n$, let $\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_p = \lambda, \lambda_{p+1} = \cdots = \lambda_n = 0$ and $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $(T_x S^n, g_n)$, such that $\langle f_*\varepsilon_j, f_*\varepsilon_k\rangle = \lambda_j^2 \delta_{jk}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
h_r(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_j) =& \langle (I_r)_*\varepsilon_i, (I_r)_*\varepsilon_j\rangle = \langle (r\varepsilon_i, \rho f_*\varepsilon_i), (r\varepsilon_j, \rho f_*\varepsilon_j)\rangle\\
=& (r^2+\rho^2\lambda_i^2)\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & i \neq j,\\ r^2+\rho^2\lambda^2 & 1 \le i = j \le p,\\ r^2 & p+1 \le i = j \le n. \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Put $\mu := r^2 + \rho^2\lambda^2$, then applying (3.17) implies $\pi : (S^n, h_r) \to (P, \mu h)$ is a Riemannian submersion and $i : (P, \mu h) \to (S^m, \mu\lambda^{-2} g_m)$ is a minimal isometric immersion.

On the other hand, by (3.17) one can easily check that $\{\pi^{-1}(y) : y \in P\}$ is an $(n-p)$-dimensional foliation of S^n satisfying Conditions (a)-(b) of Lemma 2.2. Therefore, each fibers of π are all minimal submanifolds in (S^n, h_r) if and only if they are also minimal submanifolds in (S^n, g_n), and the harmonicity of $\pi : (S^n, h_r) \to (P, \mu h)$ immediately follows from the harmonicity of $\pi : (S^n, g_n) \to (P, h)$, as in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Furthermore, based on the composition formula, one can easily deduce that $f = i \circ \pi$ is a harmonic map from (S^n, h_r) into (S^m, g_m) for any $r \in U$, and then the following conclusion is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type, ρ be a smooth function on $U \subset (0, +\infty)$, then $M_{f,\rho}$ is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$ if and only if ρ satisfies an ODE as follows:*

$$\frac{\rho_{rr}}{1+\rho_r^2} + \frac{(n-p)\rho_r}{r} + \frac{p(\frac{\rho_r}{r} - \frac{\lambda^2\rho}{r^2})}{1+\frac{\lambda^2\rho^2}{r^2}} = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

Remark. When $f = H^{2m-1,m}$ with $m = 2, 4$ or 8, the above theorem tells us $M_{f,\rho}$ is minimal if and only if

$$\frac{\rho_{rr}}{1+\rho_r^2} + \frac{(m-1)\rho_r}{r} + \frac{m(\frac{\rho_r}{r} - \frac{4\rho}{r^2})}{1+\frac{4\rho^2}{r^2}} = 0. \tag{3.19}$$

This ODE was firstly obtained by Ding-Yuan [15], based on the symmetry of Hopf maps. But the argument in the present paper is still applicable even if f is not an equivariant map.

Let us consider (3.18). As in [15], setting

$$\varphi := \frac{\rho}{r}, \quad t := \log r \tag{3.20}$$

implies

$$\rho_r = (e^t\varphi)_t \frac{dt}{dr} = \varphi_t + \varphi \tag{3.21}$$

and

$$\rho_{rr} = (\varphi_t + \varphi)_t \frac{dt}{dr} = \frac{\varphi_{tt} + \varphi_t}{r}. \tag{3.22}$$

Then (3.18) becomes

$$\frac{\varphi_{tt} + \varphi_t}{1 + (\varphi_t + \varphi)^2} + (n-p)(\varphi_t + \varphi) + \frac{p(\varphi_t + \varphi - \lambda^2\varphi)}{1 + \lambda^2\varphi^2} = 0. \tag{3.23}$$

Let

$$\psi := \varphi_t, \tag{3.24}$$

then (3.18) is equivalent to the following ODE system:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_t = \psi, \\ \psi_t = -\psi - \Big[\big(n - p + \frac{p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\psi + \big(n - p + \frac{(1-\lambda^2)p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\varphi\Big]\big[1 + (\varphi + \psi)^2\big]. \end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

This is an autonomous system. In other words, $\gamma : t \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ is a solution to (3.25) if and only γ is an integral curve of the vector field

$$X := (X_1, X_2) \tag{3.26}$$

with

(3.27)

$$X_1 := \psi,$$

$$X_2 := -\psi - \Big[\big(n - p + \frac{p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\psi + \big(n - p + \frac{(1-\lambda^2)p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\varphi\Big]\big[1 + (\varphi+\psi)^2\big].$$

Clearly, X has 2 and only 2 zero points: $(0,0)$ and $(\varphi_0, 0)$, where

$$\varphi_0 := \sqrt{\frac{p - n\lambda^{-2}}{n-p}}. \tag{3.28}$$

Remark. Due to the properties of zero points, $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi_0, 0)$ is a trivial solution to (3.25). Hence $\rho(r) = \varphi_0 r$ is a solution to (3.18) and hence $F_{f,\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$F_{f,\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} \varphi_0 |y| f(\frac{y}{|y|}) & y \neq 0 \\ 0 & y = 0 \end{cases}$$

is a Lipschitz solution to the minimal surface equations. Comparing (2.11) and (3.28) yields $\varphi_0 = \tan\theta$ and hence the minimal graph corresponding to $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi_0, 0)$ is just the LOC $C_{f,\theta}$ associated to f. On the other hand, the minimal graph corresponding to another trivial solution $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (0,0)$ of (3.25) is just the coordinate $(n+1)$-plane.

At $(0,0)$, the linearized system of (3.25) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} \varphi_t \\ \psi_t \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.29}$$

with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 p - n & -n-1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ k(k+n-1) - n & -n-1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.30}$$

A straightforward calculation shows

$$\mu_1 = k - 1, \qquad \mu_2 = -n - k \tag{3.31}$$

are the eigenvalues of A and

$$V_1 := (1, \mu_1)^T, \quad V_2 := (1, \mu_2)^T \tag{3.32}$$

are the eigenvectors associated to μ_1 and μ_2, respectively. This means $(0,0)$ is a saddle critical point of (3.25).

At $(\varphi_0, 0)$, the linearized system is

$$\begin{pmatrix} (\varphi - \varphi_0)_t \\ \psi_t \end{pmatrix} = B \begin{pmatrix} \varphi - \varphi_0 \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.33}$$

with

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ a & b \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.34}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &:= \frac{2\lambda^2(1-\lambda^2)p\varphi_0^2(1+\varphi_0^2)}{(1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)^2} = 2n\left(\frac{n}{k(k+n-1)} - 1\right), \\ b &:= -1 - \left(n - p + \frac{p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2}\right)(1+\varphi_0^2) = -n-1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.35}$$

Let μ_3, μ_4 be the eigenvalues of B, then $\mu_3 + \mu_4 = \text{tr } B = b < 0$, $\mu_3\mu_4 = |B| = -a > 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu_3 - \mu_4)^2 &= (\mu_3 + \mu_4)^2 - 4\mu_3\mu_4 = b^2 + 4a \\ &= n^2 - 6n + 1 + \frac{8n^2}{k(k+n-1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

A direct calculation shows $\{\mu_3, \mu_4\}$ is a pair of conjugate complex numbers whose real parts are negative, whenever $n = 3$, $k \geq 4$ or $n = 5, k \geq 6$; otherwise μ_3 and μ_4 are both negative numbers. Therefore

(I) If $(n, p, k) = (3, 2, 2), (5, 4, 2), (5, 4, 4)$ or $n \geq 7$, $(\varphi_0, 0)$ is a stable center of (3.25) as $t \to +\infty$;
(II) If $(n, p) = (3, 2)$, $k \geq 4$ or $(n, p) = (5, 4), k \geq 6$, $(\varphi_0, 0)$ is a stable spiral point of (3.25) as $t \to +\infty$.

Furthermore, by choosing suitable barrier functions, one can show the long-time existence of bounded solutions to (3.25) according to the values of (n, p, k) as follows.

Proposition 3.1. *If $(n, p, k) = (3, 2, 2), (5, 4, 2), (5, 4, 4)$ or $n \geq 7$, then there exists a smooth solution $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ to (3.25), such that*

- $\lim_{t\to-\infty}(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = (0, 0)$;
- $\varphi(t) = O(e^{(k-1)t})$ *and* $\psi(t) = O(e^{(k-1)t})$ *as* $t \to -\infty$;
- $\lim_{t\to+\infty}(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = (\varphi_0, 0)$;
- $t \mapsto \varphi(t)$ *is a strictly increasing function;*
- $\psi(t) > 0$ *for every* $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Namely, the orbit of this solution in the $\varphi\psi$-plane is a smooth curve lying above the φ-axis, whose endpoints are just the zero points of X: $(0,0)$ and $(\varphi_0,0)$.



Proposition 3.2. *If $(n,p)=(3,2)$, $k\geq 4$ or $(n,p)=(5,4)$, $k\geq 6$, then there exists a smooth solution $t\in\mathbb{R}\mapsto(\varphi(t),\psi(t))$ to (3.25), and a strictly increasing sequence $\{T_i : i\in\mathbb{Z}^+\}$ in $\mathbb{R}$, such that*

- $\lim\limits_{t\to-\infty}(\varphi(t),\psi(t))=(0,0)$;
- $\varphi(t)=O(e^{(k-1)t})$ *and* $\psi(t)=O(e^{(k-1)t})$ *as* $t\to-\infty$;
- $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty}(\varphi(t),\psi(t))=(\varphi_0,0)$;
- $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}T_i=+\infty$;
- $\psi(T_i)=0$ *for all* $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$;
- *Let* $\varphi_i:=\varphi(T_i)$, *then* $\{\varphi_{2m-1} : m\in\mathbb{Z}^+\}$ *is a strictly decreasing sequence and* $\{\varphi_{2m} : m\in\mathbb{Z}^+\}$ *is a strictly increasing sequence, both of which converge to* φ_0;
- $\psi(t)>0$ *for any* $t\in(-\infty,T_1)\cup\left(\bigcup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^+}(T_{2m},T_{2m+1})\right)$, $t\in(-\infty,T_1)\mapsto\varphi(t)$ *and* $t\in(T_{2m},T_{2m+1})\mapsto\varphi(t)$ *are all strictly increasing functions for all* $m\in\mathbb{Z}^+$;
- $\psi(t)<0$ *for any* $t\in\bigcup\limits_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^+}(T_{2m-1},T_{2m})$, $t\in(T_{2m-1},T_{2m})\mapsto\varphi(t)$ *is strictly decreasing for any* $m\in\mathbb{Z}^+$;
- $(\varphi+\psi)(t)>0$ *for all* $t\in\mathbb{R}$.

Namely, the orbit of this solution tends to the saddle point $(0,0)$ *as* $t \to -\infty$*, goes around the spiral point* $(\varphi_0, 0)$ *for infinitely many times as* $t \to +\infty$*.*



The proofs of the above propositions are long and subtle. So we left them in Appendix §4.3-4.4.

Based on Proposition 3.1 and 3.2, one can show the existence of entire minimal graphs associated to LOMSEs of (n,p,k)-type as follows.

Theorem 3.3. *Let* $f : S^n \to S^m$ *be an LOMSE of* (n,p,k)*-type, then there exists a smooth function* ρ *on* $(0,\infty)$*, such that the graph of* $F_{f,\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1}$

$$F_{f,\rho}(y) = \begin{cases} \rho(|y|) f(\frac{y}{|y|}) & y \neq 0, \\ 0 & y = 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.37}$$

is an entire minimal graph, whose tangent cone at infinity is $C_{f,\theta}$*, the LOC associated to* f*.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ be a long-time bounded solution to (3.25) satisfying the properties stated in Proposition 3.1 or 3.2, according to the values of (n,p,k). Now we put

$$\rho(r) = r \cdot \varphi(\log r), \tag{3.38}$$

then $r \in (0,+\infty) \mapsto \rho(r)$ is a smooth solution to (3.18). By Theorem 3.2, $M_{f,\rho}$ is a minimal submanifold in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$. In other words, $F_{f,\rho}$ is a weakly solution to the minimal surface equations, and $F_{f,\rho}$ is smooth outside the origin. In conjunction of

(3.20), (3.21), Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\rho(r) = r \cdot \varphi(\log r) = O(r^k) \tag{3.39}$$

and

$$\rho_r = \varphi(\log r) + \psi(\log r) = O(r^{k-1}) \tag{3.40}$$

as $r \to 0$. Hence F is C^1 at the origin. By Theorem 6.8.1 in [33], $F_{f,\rho}$ is real analytic.

Note that $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi(t+t_0), \psi(t+t_0))$ is also a solution to (3.25) for any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $d_0 := e^{t_0}$, then

$$\rho_{d_0}(r) := r \cdot \varphi(\log r + t_0) = \frac{1}{d_0}\rho(d_0 r) \tag{3.41}$$

is also a smooth solution to (3.18). Hence $F_{f,\rho_{d_0}}$ is also an entire analytic solution to minimal surface equations, which satisfies

$$F_{f,\rho_{d_0}}(y) = \frac{1}{d_0}F_{r,\rho}(d_0 y). \tag{3.42}$$

Therefore, $\{\Gamma(F_{f,\rho_{d_0}}) : d_0 > 1\}$ is a smooth family of minimal graphs that can be obtained from $\Gamma(F_{f,\rho})$ via the blow-down procedure, as in [20][19]. Since

$$\lim_{d_0 \to +\infty} \rho_{d_0}(r) = \lim_{t_0 \to +\infty} r \cdot \varphi(\log r + d_0) = \varphi_0 r$$

for any $r > 0$, we have

$$\lim_{d_0 \to +\infty} F_{f,\rho_{d_0}}(y) = \varphi_0 |y| f(\frac{y}{|y|}) = \tan\theta |y| f(\frac{y}{|y|})$$

for each $y \neq 0$ and hence the tangent cone of this minimal graph at infinity is just the LOC associated to f.

□

3.3. **Non-uniqueness and non-minimizing of minimal graphs.** Proposition 3.2 has the following two interesting corollaries on the non-uniqueness of analytic solutions to the Dirichlet problem and the non-minimizing of non-parametric minimal cones, respectively.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathbb{D}_{n+1}$ be the $(n+1)$-dimensional unit Euclidean ball, and $f : S^n = \partial\mathbb{D}_{n+1} \to S^m$ be an LOMSE of (n,p,k)-type, then there exists infinite many analytic solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data $f_{\varphi_0} := \varphi_0 \cdot f$, whenever $(n,p) = (3,2)$, $k \geq 4$ or $(n,p) = (5,4)$, $k \geq 6$.*

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ be the smooth solution to (3.25) satisfying the properties in Proposition 3.2, then there exist $t_1 \in (-\infty, T_1)$ and t_i between T_{i-1} and T_i for each $i \geq 2$, such that $\varphi(t_i) = \varphi_0$. Denote $d_i = e^{t_i}$, then $\rho_{d_i}(r) = r \cdot \varphi(\log r + t_i)$ is a smooth solution to (3.18) and hence $F_{f,\rho_{d_i}}$ is an analytic solution to the minimal surface equations. For each $x \in S^n$,

$$F_{f,\rho_{d_i}}(x) = \rho_{d_i}(1) f(x) = \varphi(t_i) f(x) = \varphi_0 \cdot f(x). \tag{3.43}$$

This implies $F_{f,\rho_{d_i}}|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}}$ is an analytic solution to the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data $\varphi_0 \cdot f$.

□

Remark. Similarly, one can prove: for each $\varphi \in [0, \varphi_1]$, there exists at least one analytic solution to the Dirichlet problem for $f_\varphi := \varphi \cdot f$. Moreover, $\varphi \in (\varphi_2, \varphi_1)$ implies the non-uniqueness of analytic solutions.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOMSE of (n, p, k)-type, with $(n, p) = (3, 2)$, $k \geq 4$ or $(n, p) = (5, 4)$, $k \geq 6$ and $C_{f,\theta}$ be the LOC associated to f, then $C_{f,\theta}$ is non-minimizing.*

Proof. As shown above, the restriction of $F_{f,\theta}$ defined in (1.5) and $F_{f,\rho_{d_i}}$ defined in the proof of Corollary 3.4 on $\mathbb{D}^{n+1}$ are all solutions to the Dirichlet problem for the boundary data f_{φ_0}. Noting that $\Gamma(F_{f,\theta}|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}})$ is the truncated cone $C_{f,\theta} \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(\sec\theta)$, the non-minimizing of $C_{f,\theta}$ is a direct corollary of

$$\mathrm{Vol}(M_i) < \mathrm{Vol}\left(C_{f,\theta} \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(\sec\theta)\right) \tag{3.44}$$

for any i, where $M_i := \Gamma(F_{f,\rho_{d_i}}|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}})$. So it remains to show (3.44) in the present proof.

Let M be the graph of $F_{f,\rho}$ defined in Theorem 3.3, then combining $\rho_{d_i}(r) = \frac{1}{d_i}\rho(d_i r)$ and $\rho_r = (\varphi + \psi)(\log r) > 0$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Vol}(M_i) =& \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\left(\Gamma(F_{f,\rho}|_{\mathbb{D}^{n+1}(d_i)})\right)}{d_i^{n+1}} = \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\left(M \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(\sqrt{d_i^2 + \rho(d_i)^2})\right)}{d_i^{n+1}} \\ =& \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\left(M \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(d_i \sec\theta)\right)}{d_i^{n+1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

By the Monotonicity formula for minimal submanifolds (see Proposition 1.12 of [12]), $\Theta : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$

$$\Theta(R) = \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\big(M \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(R)\big)}{\omega_{n+1} R^{n+1}} \tag{3.46}$$

is a nondecreasing function, the limitation of $\Theta(R)$ as $R \to +\infty$ is the volume density of the tangent cone $C_{f,\theta}$ of M at infinity, i.e.

$$\lim_{R \to +\infty} \Theta(R) = \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\big(C_{f,\theta} \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(R_0)\big)}{\omega_{n+1} R_0^{n+1}} \tag{3.47}$$

for any $R_0 > 0$. Moreover, for each $0 < R_1 < R_2$, $\Theta(R_1) = \Theta(R_2)$ implies $M \cap (\mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}_{R_2} \backslash \overline{\mathbb{D}}^{n+m+2}_{R_1})$ is an open subset of an minimal cone whose vertex is the origin, but this case cannot happen. Therefore $\Theta(R)$ is a strictly increasing function, and

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Vol}(M_i) &= \frac{\mathrm{Vol}\left(M \cap \mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(d_i \sec\theta)\right)}{d_i^{n+1}} = \omega_{n+1}(\sec\theta)^{n+1}\Theta(d_i\sec\theta) \\ &< \omega_{n+1}(\sec\theta)^{n+1} \lim_{R\to+\infty}\Theta(R) = \mathrm{Vol}\left(C_{f,\theta}\cap\mathbb{D}^{n+m+2}(\sec\theta)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.48}$$

This completes the proof of this theorem. □

4. Appendix

4.1. **Proof of Lemma 2.1.** Denote P to be the set consisting of all the connected components of all fibers of ϕ. More precisely, for any $\bar{x} \in \bar{N}$, let $x := \phi(\bar{x})$, $[\bar{x}]$ be the connected component of $\phi^{-1}(x)$ containing $\bar{x}$, then

$$P = \{[\bar{x}] : p \in \bar{N}\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Denote

$$\pi(\bar{x}) = [\bar{x}], \qquad i([\bar{x}]) = x. \tag{4.2}$$

Then π is a mapping from M onto P and i is a mapping from P into N, such that each fiber of π is connected, and $\phi = i \circ \pi$.

Let d be the intrinsic distance function on $\bar{N}$ induced by the Riemannian metric $\bar{g}$. Namely, for arbitrary $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \bar{N}$, $d(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ is the infimum of the length of the piecewise smooth curves in $\tilde{N}$ connecting $\bar{x}$ and $\bar{y}$. Denote by d_H the *Hausdorff distance function* (see e.g. §9.1 of [17]) on P, i.e.

$$d_H([\bar{x}_0],[\bar{y}_0]) = \max\{\sup_{\bar{x}\in[\bar{x}_0]} d(\bar{x},[\bar{y}_0]), \sup_{\bar{y}\in[\bar{y}_0]} d(\bar{y},[\bar{x}_0])\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Then (P, d_H) is a metric space equipped with the induced metric topology.

The rest of the proof of the present lemma is divided into four parts as follows.

Step 1. *Prove the existence of a homeomorphism $\Psi : [\bar{x}_0] \to [\bar{y}_0]$ for any $[\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}_0] \in P$, such that*

$$\bar{d}(\bar{x}, \Psi(\bar{x})) = d([\bar{x}_0],[\bar{y}_0]) = d_H([\bar{x}_0],[\bar{y}_0]) \tag{4.4}$$

for every $x \in [\bar{x}_0]$.

Due to the assumption on singular values, $(\phi_*)_{\bar{x}} : \left((\ker(\phi_*)_{\bar{x}})^\perp, \bar{g}\right) \subset (T_{\bar{x}}\bar{N}, \bar{g}) \to (T_xN, g)$ is an isometric embedding for any $\bar{x} \in \bar{N}$. Hence for any piecewise smooth curve $\tau : [0,1] \to N$ satisfying $\mathrm{Im}\ \tau \subset \phi(\bar{N})$ and $\tau(0) = x$, there exists a unique piecewise smooth curve $\bar{\tau} : [0,1] \to \bar{N}$, such that $\phi \circ \bar{\tau} = \tau$, $\bar{\tau}(0) = \bar{x}$ and $\bar{\tau}'(t)$ is orthogonal to the fiber of ϕ going through $\bar{\tau}(t)$ whenever $\bar{\tau}$ is differentiable at t. (This is a direct corollary of the rank theorem, see e.g. §II.7 of [5].) $\bar{\tau}$ is called the *lift curve* of τ with respect to $\bar{x}$, and the length of $\bar{\tau}$ and τ are equal.

Given $[\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}_0] \in P$. Without loss of generality one can assume $d(\bar{x}_0, \bar{y}_0) = d([\bar{x}_0],[\bar{y}_0])$. Let $\bar{\xi} : [0,1] \to \bar{N}$ be the shortest geodesic from x_0 to y_0 and $\xi := \phi \circ \bar{\xi}$,

then $L(\xi) \leq L(\bar{\xi}) = d([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}_0])$ and the equality holds if and only $\bar{\xi}'(t)$ is orthogonal to the fiber of ϕ going through $\bar{\xi}(t)$ for every $t \in [0,1]$. For any $\bar{x} \in [\bar{x}_0]$, denote by $\bar{\xi}_{\bar{x}}$ the lift curve of ξ with respect to $\bar{x}$ and let $\Psi(\bar{x}) := \bar{\xi}_{\bar{x}}(1)$, then Ψ is a continuous mapping from $[\bar{x}_0]$ into $[\bar{y}_0]$, and $d(\bar{x}, \Psi(\bar{x})) \leq L(\bar{\xi}_{\bar{x}}) = L(\xi) \leq d([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}_0])$. This forces $d(\bar{x}, \Psi(\bar{x})) = d(\bar{x}, [\bar{y}_0]) = d([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}_0])$. Let $\zeta : [0,1] \to N$ be the reverse curve of ξ, i.e. $\zeta(t) = \xi(1-t)$, then for every $\bar{y} \in [\bar{y}_0]$, one can similarly define a continuous mapping Φ from $[\bar{y}_0]$ into $[\bar{x}_0]$, such that $\Phi(\bar{y})$ is the end point of the lift curve of ζ with respect of $\bar{y}$. Moreover, $\Phi \circ \Psi = \mathbf{Id}_{[\bar{x}_0]}$ and $\Psi \circ \Phi = \mathbf{Id}_{[\bar{y}_0]}$ imply Ψ is a homemorphism between $[\bar{x}_0]$ and $[\bar{y}_0]$ and $\Phi = \Psi^{-1}$. Finally, the last equality of (4.4) directly follows from the definition of the Hausdorff distance (4.3).

Step 2. *For any $[\bar{x}_0] \in P$, show the existence of $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, such that $i|_{B_{\varepsilon_1}([\bar{x}_0])}$ is injective. Here and in the sequel $B_\varepsilon([\bar{x}])$ denotes the metric ball in (P, d_H) centered at $[\bar{x}]$ and of radius ε.*

Let $x_0 := \phi(\bar{x}_0)$. If $\phi^{-1}(x_0)$ is not connected, denote

$$\delta = \inf\{d_H([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{x}]) : \phi(\bar{x}) = x_0, [\bar{x}] \neq [\bar{x}_0]\}.$$

As shown in Step 1, δ equals the infimum of the distances between $\bar{x}_0$ and all connected components of $\phi^{-1}(x_0)$ not containing $\bar{x}_0$. Hence $\delta > 0$. We will show $\varepsilon_1 := \frac{\delta}{2}$ is the required constant.

Let $[\bar{y}_1], [\bar{y}_2] \in B_{\varepsilon_1}([\bar{x}_0])$ such that $i([\bar{y}_1]) = i([\bar{y}_2]) = y_0$, then $\phi(\bar{y}_1) = \phi(\bar{y}_2) = y_0$. One can proceed as in Step 1 to find a homemorphism $\Phi : [\bar{y}_1] \to [\bar{x}_0]$ and a curve $\sigma : [0,1] \to \phi(\bar{N}) \subset N$ from y_0 to x_0, such that for every $\bar{y} \in [\bar{y}_1]$, the lift curve $\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}$ of σ with respect to $\bar{y}$ is the shortest geodesic from $\bar{y}_1$ to $\Phi(\bar{y}_1)$, and $L(\sigma) = L(\bar{\sigma}_{\bar{y}}) = d_H([\bar{y}_1], [\bar{x}_0])$. Denote by $\bar{\sigma}_2$ the lift curve of σ with respect to $\bar{y}_2$, then $\bar{x}_2 := \bar{\sigma}_2(1) \in \phi^{-1}(x_0)$ and

$$d_H([\bar{y}_2], [\bar{x}_2]) = d([\bar{y}_2], [\bar{x}_2]) \leq L(\bar{\sigma}_2) = L(\sigma) < \varepsilon_1.$$

The triangle inequality yields

$$d_H([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{x}_2]) \leq d_H([\bar{y}_2], [\bar{x}_0]) + d_H([\bar{y}_2], [\bar{x}_2]) < 2\varepsilon_1 = \delta.$$

This forces $[\bar{x}_2] = [\bar{x}_0]$. Let $\Psi := \Phi^{-1}$, then $\bar{y}_2 = \Psi(\bar{x}_2) \in [\bar{y}_1]$ and hence $[\bar{y}_1] = [\bar{y}_2]$. The arbitrariness of $[\bar{y}_1], [\bar{y}_2]$ implies $i|_{B_{\varepsilon_1}([\bar{x}_0])}$ is an injective mapping.

On the other hand, once $\phi^{-1}(x_0)$ is connected, one can proceed as above to show $\phi^{-1}(x)$ is also connected for each $x \in \phi(\bar{N})$, i.e. i is an injective mapping from P into N.

Step 3. *For any $[\bar{x}_0] \in P$, show the existence of $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, such that the image of $i|_{B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])}$ is a p-dimensional embedded submanifold of N.*

Denote by $\tilde{B}_\varepsilon(\bar{x})$ the geodesic ball in $\bar{N}$ centered at $\bar{x}$ and of radius ε. By the rank theorem, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, such that the image of $\phi|_{\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0)}$ is a p-dimensional embedded submanifold of N. It remains to show $i(B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])) = \phi(\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0))$.

For any $\bar{y} \in \tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0)$, $d_H([\bar{y}], [\bar{x}_0]) \leq d(\bar{y}, \bar{x}_0) < \varepsilon_2$ and hence $\phi(\bar{y}) = i([\bar{y}]) \in i(B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0]))$. This implies $\phi(\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0)) \subset i(B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0]))$. On the other hand, for an

arbitrary $[\bar{y}] \in B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])$, we can proceed as in Step 1 to find a homemorphism $\Psi : [\bar{x}_0] \to [\bar{y}]$, such that $d(\bar{x}, \Psi(\bar{x})) = d_H([\bar{x}_0], [\bar{y}])$ for every $\bar{x} \in [\bar{x}_0]$. In particular, letting $\bar{y}_0 := \Psi(\bar{x}_0)$ gives $d(\bar{x}_0, \bar{y}_0) < \varepsilon_2$ and hence $i([\bar{y}]) = i([\bar{y}_0]) = \phi(y_0) \in \phi(\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0))$, i.e. $i(B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])) \subset \phi(\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0))$. Therefore $i(B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])) = \phi(\tilde{B}_{\varepsilon_2}(\bar{x}_0))$ and the image of i restricting on $B_{\varepsilon_2}([\bar{x}_0])$ is an embedded submanifold of N.

Step 4. *Construct a differential structure and a Riemannian metric on P.*

Let $\varepsilon := \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$, then $B_\varepsilon([\bar{x}_0])$ has a 1:1 correspondence with a p-dimensional embedded submanifold of N. One can easily endow P with a differential structure, such that $i : B_\varepsilon([\bar{x}_0]) \to i(B_\varepsilon([\bar{x}_0]))$ is a diffeomorphism, which implies $\pi|_{\tilde{B}(\bar{x}_0)} = \left(i|_{B_\varepsilon([\bar{x}_0])}\right)^{-1} \circ \phi|_{\tilde{B}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_0)}$ is a smooth mapping. Therefore, both i and π are smooth. Moreover, by letting $h := i^* g$, it is easy to check that π is a Riemannian submersion from $(\bar{N}, \bar{g})$ onto (P, h) and i is an isometric immersion from (P, h) into (N, g). This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.

4.2. **Proof of Corollary 2.2.** Let $f : S^n \to S^m$ be an LOM and $M_{f,\theta}$ be the associated LOS. For any $x \in S^n$, denote by $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n$ the singular values of $(f_*)_x$, and let $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $(T_x S^n, g_n)$, such that $\langle f_* \varepsilon_j, f_* \varepsilon_k \rangle = \lambda_j^2 \delta_{jk}$. Denote

$$E_j = \frac{(\cos\theta \varepsilon_j, \sin\theta f_* \varepsilon_j)}{\sqrt{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta \lambda_j^2}} \qquad \forall 1 \le j \le n, \tag{4.5}$$

then $\{E_1, \cdots, E_n\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the tangent plane of $M_{f,\theta}$ at $I_{f,\theta}(x)$. Noting that the orthogonal complement of the normal plane of $M_{f,\theta}$ at $I_{f,\theta}(x)$ is spanned by the position vector $\mathbf{X}$ and the tangent plane, we have

$$*(\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_{m+1}) = \mathbf{X} \wedge E_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge E_n$$

with $*$ the *Hodge star operator* on $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$ and $\{\nu_1, \cdots, \nu_{m+1}\}$ being an oriented orthonormal basis of the normal plane.

Let $Q_0 := \{x_1 = \cdots = x_{n+1} = 0\}$ to be a fixed $(m+1)$-plane in $\mathbb{R}^{n+m+2}$, with $\{\varepsilon_{n+2}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{n+m+2}\}$ as its oriented orthonormal basis, and α be the angle between the normal plane of $M_{f,\theta}$ at $I_{f,\theta}(x)$ and Q_0, then applying (2.2) and (4.5) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\cos\alpha &= \langle \nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_{m+1}, \varepsilon_{n+2} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_{n+m+2} \rangle \\
&= \langle *(\nu_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \nu_{m+1}), *(\varepsilon_{n+2} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_{n+m+2}) \rangle \\
&= \langle \mathbf{X} \wedge E_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge E_n, \mathbf{Y}_1 \wedge \varepsilon_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \varepsilon_n \rangle \\
&= \begin{vmatrix} \langle \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}_1 \rangle & \langle \mathbf{X}, \varepsilon_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle \mathbf{X}, \varepsilon_n \rangle \\ \langle E_1, \mathbf{Y}_1 \rangle & \langle E_1, \varepsilon_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle E_1, \varepsilon_n \rangle \\ & \cdots & & \\ \langle E_n, \mathbf{Y}_1 \rangle & \langle E_n, \varepsilon_1 \rangle & \cdots & \langle E_n, \varepsilon_n \rangle \end{vmatrix} \\
&= \cos\theta \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta \lambda_j^2}}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

In conjunction with this equation and Theorem 2.3, we arrive at (2.23).

Let dV be the volume form of (S^n, g) ($g := I_{f,\theta}^* g_{n+m+1}$ denotes the pull-back metric), then

$$\begin{aligned} dV &= \sqrt{\det\big(g(e_j, e_k)\big)}\ \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_n \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{n} \sqrt{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta \lambda_j^2}\ \omega_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_n, \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where the definition of $\{e_1, \cdots, e_n\}$ is same as in (2.9), and $\{\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_n\}$ is the dual basis of $\{\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n\}$. Integrating both hand sides of (4.7) over S^n gives (2.24).

Let $C_{f,\theta}$ be the cone generated by $M_{f,\theta}$, then an arbitrary point y of $C_{f,\theta}$ lies in a ray starting from the origin and going through $I_{f,\theta}(x) \in M_{f,\theta}$ for some $x \in S^n$, and the tangent plane $T_y C_{f,\theta}$ is spanned by the direction vector of this ray and the tangent plane of $M_{f,\theta}$ at $I_{f,\theta}(x)$, i.e. $T_y C_{f,\theta} = \operatorname{span}\{\mathbf{X}, E_1, \cdots, E_n\}$. It is easy to check that, $\mathbf{X}, E_1, \cdots, E_n$ are just the *angle directions* (see [44] for the definition) of $T_y C_{f,\theta}$ relative to $Q_0^{\perp}$, whose corresponding Jordan angles are

(4.8)
$$\theta_0 = \theta, \theta_1 = \arccos\left(\frac{\cos\theta}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_1^2}\right), \cdots, \theta_n = \arccos\left(\frac{\cos\theta}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_n^2}\right).$$

A calculation as in [48][26] shows, the slope function of $C_{f,\theta}$

$$W = \prod_{j=0}^{n} \sec\theta_j = \sec\theta \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{\sqrt{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta\lambda_j^2}}{\cos\theta} \tag{4.9}$$

and then Corollary 2.2 (C) immediately follows from Theorem 2.4.

4.3. **Proof of Proposition 3.1.** Let D be a bounded closed domain of the $\varphi\psi$-plane enclosed by the line segment from $(0,0)$ to $(\varphi_0, 0)$ and the graph of the function $h : [0, \varphi_0] \to \mathbb{R}$

$$h(\varphi) = \frac{\big(\frac{(\lambda^2-1)p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2} - (n-p)\big)\varphi}{c(n-p)} \tag{4.10}$$

with $c \in (0, 1]$ being a constant to be chosen.



We shall prove D is a positive invariant set of (3.25) by verifying that the vector field $X = (X_1, X_2)$ points inward at each point of ∂D except at the zero points $(0, 0)$ and $(\varphi_0, 0)$. In other words, we need to show:

(A) $X_2(\varphi, 0) > 0$ for each $\varphi \in (0, \varphi_0)$;
(B) $h'(\varphi) > \frac{X_2}{X_1}(\varphi, h(\varphi))$ for each $\varphi \in (0, \varphi_0)$.

Here (A) is obvious, but (B) needs a careful calculation as follows.

Denote

$$f_1(\varphi) = \frac{(\lambda^2 - 1)p}{1 + \lambda^2\varphi^2} - (n - p)$$
$$f_2(\varphi) = n - p + \frac{p}{1 + \lambda^2\varphi^2} \tag{4.11}$$

then

$$h(\varphi) = \frac{f_1(\varphi)\varphi}{c(n - p)} \tag{4.12}$$

and hence

$$h'(\varphi) = \frac{f_1(\varphi) + f_1'(\varphi)\varphi}{c(n - p)}. \tag{4.13}$$

Due to (3.27), (4.11), (4.12) and (4.13), (B) is equivalent to

(4.14)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < h'(\varphi) + 1 + \Big[n - p + \frac{p}{1 + \lambda^2\varphi^2} + \big(n - p + \frac{(1 - \lambda^2)p}{1 + \lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\frac{\varphi}{h(\varphi)}\Big]\big[1 + (\varphi + h(\varphi))^2\big] \\ = \left(1 + \frac{f_1(\varphi)}{c(n - p)}\right) + \frac{f_1'(\varphi)\varphi}{c(n - p)} + (f_2(\varphi) - c(n - p))\left[1 + \varphi^2\big(1 + \frac{f_1(\varphi)}{c(n - p)}\big)^2\right] \\ := I + II + III \cdot IV. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.28),

$$\lambda^2\varphi_0^2 = \frac{\lambda^2 p - n}{n-p}, \qquad 1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2 = \frac{(\lambda^2-1)p}{n-p}. \tag{4.15}$$

Let

$$s := \frac{1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2} - 1, \tag{4.16}$$

then $\varphi \in (0,\varphi_0)$ implies $s \in (0,\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) = (0, \frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p})$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2} &= \frac{1+s}{1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2} = \frac{n-p}{(\lambda^2-1)p}(1+s), \\ \lambda^2\varphi^2 &= \frac{1+\lambda^2\varphi_0^2}{1+s} - 1 = \frac{\lambda^2\varphi_0^2 - s}{1+s} = \frac{\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p} - s}{1+s}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

It immediately follows that

$$f_1(\varphi) = (n-p)s, \tag{4.18}$$

$$f_2(\varphi) = \frac{(n-p)(\lambda^2+s)}{\lambda^2-1} \tag{4.19}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f_1'(\varphi)\varphi &= -\frac{2(\lambda^2-1)p\lambda^2\varphi^2}{(1+\lambda^2\varphi^2)^2} \\ &= -2(\lambda^2-1)p\big(1-\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2} \\ &= -\frac{2(n-p)}{(\lambda^2-1)p}(\lambda^2 p - n - (n-p)s)(1+s). \end{aligned} \tag{4.20}$$

Therefore

$$I = 1 + \frac{s}{c} := I(s), \tag{4.21}$$

$$II = -\frac{2(n-p)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p}\left(\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p} - s\right)(1+s) := II(s), \tag{4.22}$$

$$III = \frac{n-p}{\lambda^2-1}(\lambda^2 - c(\lambda^2-1) + s) := III(s) \tag{4.23}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} IV &= 1+\varphi^2(1+\frac{f_1(\varphi)}{c(n-p)})^2 \\ &= 1+\lambda^{-2}(\lambda^2\varphi^2)(1+\frac{f_1(\varphi)}{c(n-p)})(1+\frac{f_1(\varphi)}{c(n-p)}) \\ &= 1+\lambda^{-2}(\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p}-s)\frac{1+\frac{s}{c}}{1+s}(1+\frac{s}{c}) \\ &\geq 1+\lambda^{-2}(\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p}-s)(1+\frac{s}{c}) \\ &:= IV(s). \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Let

$$F(s) := I(s)+II(s)+III(s)\cdot IV(s), \tag{4.25}$$

then $I+II+III\cdot IV \geq F(s)$ whenever $s\in(0,\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)$, i.e $\varphi\in(0,\varphi_0)$. It is easily seen that $F(s)$ is a cubic polynomial of s and the coefficient of the third order term is $-\frac{n-p}{c\lambda^2(\lambda^2-1)}<0$. Hence $F(s)=F(0)+sG(s)$ with $G(s)$ a quadratic polynomial, whose coefficient of the second order term is negative. Thus $G(s)\geq\min\{G(0),G(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)\}$ for each $s\in(0,\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)$. Therefore, to prove (4.14), it suffices to show

- $F(0)\geq 0$;
- $G(0)>0$;
- $G(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)>0$.

A straightforward calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} F(0) &= I(0)+II(0)+III(0)\cdot IV(0) \\ &= 1-\frac{2(\lambda^2 p-n)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p}+(n-p)(\frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2-1}-c)(1+\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{\lambda^2(n-p)}) \\ &= 1+n-\frac{2(\lambda^2 p-n)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p}-\frac{c(\lambda^2-1)n}{\lambda^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

$$\begin{aligned} G(0) =& F'(0) = I'(0)+II'(0)+III'(0)\cdot IV(0)+III(0)\cdot IV'(0) \\ =& \frac{1}{c}-\frac{2(n-p)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p}(\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{n-p}-1)+\frac{n-p}{\lambda^2-1}(1+\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{\lambda^2(n-p)}) \\ &+(n-p)(\frac{\lambda^2}{\lambda^2-1}-c)\lambda^{-2}(\frac{\lambda^2 p-n}{c(n-p)}-1) \\ =& (\frac{1}{c}-1)p-\frac{1}{c}+\frac{(\frac{4-p}{c}-p)(n-p)}{\lambda^2 p-p}+\frac{(c+2)n-cp}{\lambda^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) &= I(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) + II(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) + III(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2)\cdot IV(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) \\
&= 1 + \frac{\lambda^2 p - n}{c(n-p)} + \frac{n-p}{\lambda^2-1}(\lambda^2 - c(\lambda^2-1) + \frac{\lambda^2 p - n}{n-p}) \\
&= 1 + n + \frac{\lambda^2 p - n}{c(n-p)} - c(n-p)
\end{aligned} \tag{4.28}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
G(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) &= \frac{F(\lambda^2\varphi_0^2) - F(0)}{\lambda^2\varphi_0^2} \\
&= \frac{1}{c} + \frac{c(n-p)}{\lambda^2} + \frac{2(n-p)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p} > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}
$$

Now we choose c according to the values of (n, p, k):

Case 1. $(n, p, k) = (3, 2, 2)$.

Put $c := 1$, then

$$F(0) = 4 - \frac{5}{3c} - \frac{9c}{4} = \frac{1}{12} > 0$$

and

$$G(0) = \frac{4}{3c} - \frac{5}{6} + \frac{c}{4} = \frac{3}{4} > 0.$$

Case 2. $(n, p, k) = (5, 4, 2)$.

Put $c := 1$, then

$$F(0) = 6 - \frac{7}{4c} - \frac{10c}{3} = \frac{11}{12} > 0$$

and

$$G(0) = \frac{3}{c} - \frac{7}{6} + \frac{c}{3} = \frac{13}{6} > 0.$$

Case 3. $(n, p, k) = (5, 4, 4)$.

Put $c := \frac{6}{7}$, then

$$F(0) = 6 - \frac{27}{14c} - \frac{35c}{8} = 0$$

and

$$G(0) = \frac{3}{c} - \frac{81}{28} + \frac{c}{8} = \frac{5}{7} > 0.$$

Case 4. $n \geq 7$.

In this case, Theorem 2.4 tells us $p < n < 2p$ and $p \geq 4$.

Take $c := \frac{1}{2}$, then $n > p$ implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(0) &= 1 + n - \frac{2(\lambda^2 p - n)}{c(\lambda^2-1)p} - \frac{c(\lambda^2-1)n}{\lambda^2} \\
&\geq 1 + n - \frac{2}{c} - cn = \frac{n}{2} - 3 > 0
\end{aligned}
$$

and $2p > n$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}&(\lambda^2 p - p) - 3(n-p) = k(k+n-1) - p - 3(n-p)\\ \geq& 2(n+1) - p - 3(n-p) = 2p - n + 2 > 0,\end{aligned}$$

i.e. $\frac{n-p}{\lambda^2 p - p} < \frac{1}{3}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}G(0) &= p - 2 + \frac{(8-3p)(n-p)}{\lambda^2 p - p} + \frac{5n-p}{2\lambda^2}\\ &> p - 2 + \frac{8-3p}{3} > 0\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have proved (B) for all cases. Therefore, D is a positive invariant set of (3.25).

Since $(0,0)$ is a saddle critical point, there exists a smooth solution $t \in (-\infty, T_\infty) \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ to (3.25), such that $\lim_{t\to-\infty}(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = (0,0)$. Here $T_\infty \in \mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ such that $(-\infty, T_\infty)$ is the maximal existence interval of this solution. Moreover, by Theorem 3.5 in §VIII of [21], as $t \to -\infty$, $\varphi(t) = O(e^{\mu_1 t})$, $\psi(t) = O(e^{\mu_1 t})$ and the direction of $(\varphi(t), \psi(t))^T$ converges to the direction of V_1, i.e. the eigenvector of A associate to μ_1 (see (3.30), (3.31) and (3.32) for the definitions of A, μ_1 and V_1). It is easy to check that $h'(0) > \mu_1$. Then there exists $t_0 \in (-\infty, T_\infty)$, such that $(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) \in D$ for every $t \in (-\infty, t_0)$. Since D is a bounded positive invariant set, $(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) \in D$ for each $t \in (-\infty, T_\infty)$, and $T_\infty = +\infty$. This implies $\psi(t) \geq 0$ for all t. Moreover, if $\psi(t_1) = 0$ for some $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, then ψ attains its minimal value at t_1 and hence $X_2(\varphi(t_1), 0) = \psi'(t_1) = 0$, which causes a contradiction to (A). Therefore $\psi(t) > 0$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and then $\varphi'(t) = \psi(t) > 0$, i.e. $t \mapsto \varphi(t)$ is strictly increasing. As $t \to +\infty$, the ω-limit set of this orbit can only be a limit cycle or a critical point in D. The former cannot occur, due to the monotonicity of φ. Thus $\lim_{t\to+\infty}(\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = (\varphi_0, 0)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1.

4.4. **Proof of Proposition 3.2.** The proof of this proposition relies on the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(n,p) = (3,2)$, $k \geq 4$ or $(n,p) = (5,4)$, $k \geq 6$, $t \in [b_0, b_2] \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ be a smooth solution to (3.25), $b_1 \in (b_0, b_2)$, such that*

- $\varphi(b_0) \geq \sqrt{\frac{3p-n-1}{3(n-p)}}$;
- $\psi(b_0) = \psi(b_1) = \psi(b_2) = 0$;
- $\psi(t) > 0$ *for any* $t \in (b_0, b_1)$, $\psi(t) < 0$ *for any* $t \in (b_1, b_2)$.

Then $\varphi(b_1) > \varphi_0$ and $\varphi(b_0) < \varphi(b_2) < \varphi_0$.

Remark. This lemma tells us, there exists no limit cycle of (3.25) entirely lying on the right of the straight line $\varphi = \sqrt{\frac{3p-n-1}{3(n-p)}}$.

Proof. By (3.25),

$$\psi_t = -\psi - (f_2(\varphi)\psi - f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[1+(\varphi+\psi)^2\big], \tag{4.30}$$

where the definition of f_1 and f_2 is same as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. The assumption on ψ implies $0 \geq \psi'(b_1) = f_1(\varphi(b_1))\varphi(b_1)\big(1+\varphi(b_1)^2\big)$ and hence $\varphi(b_1) \geq \varphi_0$. On the other hand, the fact that $(\varphi_0, 0)$ is a zero point of X forces $\varphi(b_1) \neq \varphi_0$. Therefore $\varphi(b_1) > \varphi_0$ and $\psi'(b_1) < 0$. Similarly one can prove $\varphi(b_0), \varphi(b_2) < \varphi_0$.

Denote

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{\varphi} = \varphi \\ \tilde{\psi} = -\psi \end{cases} \tag{4.31}$$

Then (3.25) implies

$$\tilde{\varphi}_t = \psi = -\tilde{\psi} \tag{4.32}$$

and

(4.33)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_t &= \psi + \Big[\big(n-p+\frac{p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\psi + \big(n-p+\frac{(1-\lambda^2)p}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\big)\varphi\Big]\big[1+(\varphi+\psi)^2\big] \\ &= -\tilde{\psi} + \Big[-\big(n-p+\frac{p}{1+\lambda^2\tilde{\varphi}^2}\big)\tilde{\psi} + \big(n-p+\frac{(1-\lambda^2)p}{1+\lambda^2\tilde{\varphi}^2}\big)\tilde{\varphi}\Big]\big[1+(\tilde{\varphi}-\tilde{\psi})^2\big] \\ &= -\tilde{\psi} - \big(f_2(\tilde{\varphi})\tilde{\psi} + f_1(\tilde{\varphi})\tilde{\varphi}\big)\big[1+(\tilde{\varphi}-\tilde{\psi})^2\big]. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, if we denote $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} &Y_1(\varphi,\psi) = -\psi, \\ &Y_2(\varphi,\psi) = -\psi - (f_2(\varphi)\psi + f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[1+(\varphi-\psi)^2\big], \end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

then $t \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ is an integral curve of the vector field X if and only $t \mapsto (\tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\psi}(t))$ is an integral curve of Y.

Let D be a closed domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$ enclosed by the line segment from $(\varphi(b_0), 0)$ to $(\varphi(b_1), 0)$ and the curve $\gamma : t \in (b_0, b_1) \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$. Now we claim

(A) There exists $\varepsilon > 0$, such that $(\tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\psi}(t))$ lies in the interior of D for any $t \in (b_1, b_1+\varepsilon]$;

(B) $\begin{vmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ Y_1 & Y_2 \end{vmatrix} < 0$ at (φ, ψ) whenever $\varphi \geq \sqrt{\frac{3p-n-1}{3(n-p)}}$ and $\psi > 0$.

Once both of them holds, one can derive the final conclusion as follows. Let $\sigma : (T_0, 0] \to D$ be the integral curve of X, such that $\sigma(0) = (\tilde{\varphi}(b_1+\varepsilon), \tilde{\psi}(b_1+\varepsilon))$ and T_0 is $-\infty$ or a negative number satisfying $\lim\limits_{t\to T_0^+} \sigma(t) \in \partial D$. Here the former case cannot occur, because (3.25) has neither stable critical points nor saddle points in D as $t \to -\infty$. Furthermore, the uniqueness of the initial value problem of ODE ensures that $\sigma(T_0) = \lim\limits_{t\to T_0^+} \sigma(t)$ cannot lie in γ. Thus $\sigma(T_0) = (a_1, 0)$ with $a_1 \in (\varphi(b_0), \varphi(b_1))$. Denote $\tau : t \in (b_1, b_1+\varepsilon] \mapsto (\tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\psi}(t)) \in D$ and let $\tilde{D}$ be a

closed domain of $\mathbb{R}^2$ enclosed by the line segment from $(a_1, 0)$ to $(\varphi(b_1), 0)$, the curve τ and the curve σ.



Claim (B) tells us that the vector field Y points in the interior of $\tilde{D}$ at each point of σ, which implies $(\tilde{\varphi}(b_2), \tilde{\psi}(b_2)$ lies in $\tilde{D}$, and hence $\varphi(b_2) = \tilde{\varphi}(b_2) \geq a_1 > \varphi(b_0)$.

It remains to prove (A) and (B).

Let δ be a positive number. When δ is sufficiently small, there exists $s > 0$, such that $\delta = \psi(b_1 - s)$. A straightforward calculation based on $\varphi_t = \psi$ shows

$$\varphi(b_1 - s) = \varphi(b_1) + \frac{1}{2\psi_t(b_1)}\delta^2 - \frac{\psi_{tt}(b_1)}{3\psi_t(b_1)^3}\delta^3 + O(\delta^4).$$

Similarly, there is $u > 0$, such that $\delta = \tilde{\psi}(b_1 + u)$ when δ is sufficiently small, and

$$\tilde{\varphi}(b_1 + u) = \varphi(b_1) + \frac{1}{2\psi_t(b_1)}\delta^2 + \frac{\psi_{tt}(b_1)}{3\psi_t(b_1)^3}\delta^3 + O(\delta^4).$$

By (4.30),

$$\psi_{tt}(b_1) = -\psi_t(b_1) - f_2(\varphi(b_1))\psi_t(b_1)\big(1 + \varphi(b_1)^2\big) + 2f_1(\varphi(b_1))\varphi(b_1)^2\psi_t(b_1) > 0$$

and hence $\frac{\psi_{tt}(b_1)}{3\psi_t(b_1)^3} < 0$. Therefore, when δ is sufficiently small, $\psi(b_1 - s) = \tilde{\psi}(b_1 + u) = \delta$ implies $\tilde{\varphi}(b_1 + u) < \varphi(b_1 - s)$. Claim (A) is proved.

$\psi > 0$ implies $X_1 = -Y_1 = \psi > 0$, hence Claim (B) equals to saying that $Y_2 + X_2 < 0$. A straightforward calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 + X_2 =& -\psi - (f_2(\varphi)\psi + f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[(1 + (\varphi - \psi)^2\big] \\ & -\psi - (f_2(\varphi)\psi - f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[1 + (\varphi + \psi)^2\big] \\ =& -2\psi - 2f_2(\varphi)\psi(1 + \varphi^2 + \psi^2) + 4f_1(\varphi)\varphi^2\psi \\ \leq& 2\psi(-1 - f_2(\varphi)(1 + \varphi^2) + 2f_1(\varphi)\varphi^2), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&-1-f_2(\varphi)(1+\varphi^2)+2f_1(\varphi)\varphi^2\\
=&\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\Big[-1-\lambda^2\varphi^2-(1+\varphi^2)\big((n-p)(1+\lambda^2\varphi^2)+p\big)\\
&\qquad+2\varphi^2\big((\lambda^2-1)p-(n-p)(1+\lambda^2\varphi^2)\big)\Big]\\
=&\frac{1}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\left[-3\lambda^2(n-p)\varphi^4+\big(\lambda^2(3p-n-1)-3n\big)\varphi^2-n-1\right]\\
<&-\frac{3\lambda^2(n-p)}{1+\lambda^2\varphi^2}\varphi^2(\varphi^2-\frac{3p-n-1}{3(n-p)})\le 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereby Claim (B) holds and we complete the proof of the present lemma. □

As in the proof of Proposition 3.1, one can prove that there exists a smooth solution $t\in(-\infty,T_\infty)\mapsto(\varphi(t),\psi(t)\in\mathbb{R}^2$ to (3.25), where $(-\infty,T_\infty)$ is the maximal existence interval, such that $\lim_{t\to-\infty}(\varphi(t),\psi(t))=(0,0)$, $\varphi(t)=O(e^{\mu_1 t})$, $\psi(t)=O(e^{\mu_1 t})$ and the direction of $(\varphi(t),\psi(t))^T$ converges to the direction of V_1 as $t\to-\infty$. The rest of the proof of Proposition 3.2 shall be derived into several parts as follows.

Step 1. *Show the existence of $t_1\in\mathbb{R}$, such that $\psi(t)>0$ for all $t\in(-\infty,t_1]$, and*

$$\varphi(t_1)=\varphi_0,\quad \psi(t_1)\le\frac{1}{5}\varphi_0. \tag{4.35}$$

Denote $g:[0,\varphi_0]\to\mathbb{R}$

$$g(\varphi)=(2f_1(\varphi)+\frac{1}{5})\varphi. \tag{4.36}$$

Let D be a closed domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ enclosed by the line segment l_1 from $(0,0)$ to $(\varphi_0,0)$, the graph of the function g (denoted by γ), and the line segment l_2 from $(\varphi_0,0)$ to

$(\varphi_0, \frac{1}{5}\varphi_0)$.



We claim the vector field X points in the interior of D at the each point of l_1 and γ, in other words,

(A) $X_2(\varphi, 0) > 0$ for each $\varphi \in (0, \varphi_0)$;
(B) $g'(\varphi) > \frac{X_2}{X_1}(\varphi, g(\varphi))$ for any $\varphi \in (0, \varphi_0)$.

Here (A) is easily checked as in §4.3 and (B) equals to saying that
(4.37)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 <& g'(\varphi) + 1 + \left(f_2(\varphi) - \frac{\varphi f_1(\varphi)}{g(\varphi)} \right) \left[1 + (\varphi + g(\varphi))^2 \right] \\ =& (\frac{6}{5} + 2f_1(\varphi)) - (-2f_1'(\varphi)\varphi) + \left(f_2(\varphi) - \frac{f_1(\varphi)}{2f_1(\varphi) + \frac{1}{5}} \right) \left[1 + \varphi^2 (\frac{6}{5} + 2f_1(\varphi))^2 \right] \\ :=& I - II + III \cdot IV \end{aligned}$$

As in §4.3, we put

$$s := \frac{1 + \lambda^2 \varphi_0^2}{1 + \lambda^2 \varphi^2} - 1,$$

then $s \in (0, \lambda^2\varphi_0^2)$ and a similar calculation shows

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \frac{6}{5} + 2s, \\ II &= \frac{4}{(\lambda^2-1)p}(\lambda^2 p - n - s)(1+s), \\ III &= \frac{\lambda^2+s}{\lambda^2-1} - \frac{s}{2s+\frac{1}{5}}, \\ IV &= 1 + \frac{\lambda^2 p - n - s}{\lambda^2(1+s)}(\frac{6}{5}+2s)^2 = 1 + \frac{(\lambda^2-1)p}{4\lambda^2}\left(\frac{\frac{6}{5}+2s}{1+s}\right)^2 \cdot II. \end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & I - II + III \cdot IV \\ =& I + III + \left[\frac{(\lambda^2-1)p}{4\lambda^2}\left(\frac{\frac{6}{5}+2s}{1+s}\right)^2 \cdot III - 1\right] \cdot II \\ \geq& I + III + \left[\frac{p}{4}\left(\frac{\frac{6}{5}+2s}{1+s}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{s}{2s+\frac{1}{5}}\right) - 1\right] \cdot II \end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Let

$$F(s) := \left(\frac{\frac{6}{5}+2s}{1+s}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{s}{2s+\frac{1}{5}}\right) = \frac{4}{25}\left(\frac{3+5s}{1+s}\right)^2 \frac{1+5s}{1+10s}. \tag{4.40}$$

Then

$$\log F = \log\frac{4}{25} + 2\log(3+5s) - 2\log(1+s) + \log(1+5s) - \log(1+10s)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\log F}{ds} &= \frac{10}{3+5s} - \frac{2}{1+s} + \frac{5}{1+5s} - \frac{10}{1+10s} \\ &= \frac{-11+20s+175s^2}{(3+5s)(1+s)(1+5s)(1+10s)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $F'(s) = 0 (> 0, < 0)$ if and only if $s = \frac{1}{5} (> \frac{1}{5}, < \frac{1}{5})$, and

$$\min_{s\in(0,\infty)} F = F(\frac{1}{5}) = \frac{32}{27}. \tag{4.41}$$

If $(n,p) = (5,4)$, then substituting (4.41) into (4.39) implies

$$I - II + III \cdot IV \geq I + III + \frac{5}{27} II > 0 \tag{4.42}$$

If $(n,p)=(3,2)$, again substituting (4.41) into (4.39) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & I-II+III\cdot IV \geq I+III-\frac{11}{27}II \\ =&\frac{6}{5}+2s+\frac{\lambda^2+s}{\lambda^2-1}-\frac{s}{2s+\frac{1}{5}}-\frac{22}{27(\lambda^2-1)}(2\lambda^2-3-s)(1+s) \\ \geq&\frac{6}{5}+2s+1-\frac{s}{2s+\frac{1}{5}}-\frac{44}{27}(1+s) \\ =&\frac{19}{270}+\frac{10}{27}s+\frac{1}{20s+2}>0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Hence (B) holds for both cases.

It is easy check that $g'(0)>\mu_1$. hence there exists t_0, such that $(\varphi(t),\psi(t))\in D$ for every $t\in(-\infty,t_0)$. Let

$$t_1:=\sup\{s\in(-\infty,T_\infty]:(\varphi(t),\psi(t))\in D \text{ for each } t\in(-\infty,s)\}. \tag{4.44}$$

Then $\psi(t)\geq 0$ for each $t\in(-\infty,t_1)$ and hence $t\in(-\infty,t_1)\mapsto\varphi(t)$ is an increasing function. If $t_1=+\infty$, then $(\varphi(t),\psi(t))$ converges to a zero point of X as $t\to+\infty$, which implies $\lim\limits_{t\to+\infty}(\varphi(t),\psi(t))=(\varphi_0,0)$. This contradicts to the fact that $(\varphi_0,0)$ is a spiral point of (3.25). Thus $t_1<+\infty$ and $(\varphi(t_1),\psi(t_1))\in\partial D$. Since X points in the interior of D at each point of l_1 or γ, $(\varphi(t_1),\psi(t_1))$ should lie in l_2, and then (4.35) is obtained.

Step 2. *Show the existence of $T_1\in\mathbb{R}$, such that $\psi(T_1)=0$, $\varphi_1:=\varphi(T_1)>\varphi_0$ and $\psi(t)>0$ for any $t\in(-\infty,T_1)$.*

Denote

$$T_1:=\sup\{s\in(t_1,T_\infty]:\psi(t)>0 \text{ for each } t\in[t_1,s)\}. \tag{4.45}$$

Then $\psi(t)>0$ for each $t\in[t_1,T_1)$ and hence $t\in[t_1,T_1)\mapsto\varphi(t)$ is strictly increasing, which implies $\varphi(t)\geq\varphi_0$ and $f_1(\varphi(t))\leq 0$ for each $t\in[t_1,T_1)$, and moreover

$$(\varphi+\psi)_t=-(f_2(\varphi)\psi-f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[1+(\varphi+\psi)^2\big]\leq 0. \tag{4.46}$$

Hence $\varphi(t)+\psi(t)\leq\varphi(t_1)+\psi(t_1)\leq\frac{6}{5}\varphi_0$ for every $t\in[t_1,T_1)$. If $T_1=+\infty$, then $(\varphi(t),\psi(t)$ must converge to a zero point of X as $t\to T_1^-$. This is impossible. Therefore $T_1<+\infty$ and $\psi(T_1)=0$, $\varphi(T_1)>\varphi_0$.

Step 3. *Show the existence of $T_2\in(T_1,+\infty)$, such that $\psi(T_2)=0$, $\varphi_2:=\varphi(T_2)\in[\frac{4}{5}\varphi_0,\varphi_0)$ and $\psi(t)<0$, $\varphi(t)+\psi(t)\geq\frac{4}{5}\varphi_0$ for any $t\in(T_1,T_2)$.*

Let D' be a closed domain enclosed by the straight line m_1 from $(\varphi_0,0)$ to $(\varphi_1,0)$, the straight line m_2 from $(\varphi_0,0)$ to $(\varphi_0,\psi(t_1))$, and the curve $\sigma:t\in[t_1,T_1]\mapsto(\varphi(t),\psi(t))$. As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, $t\mapsto(\tilde\varphi(t),\tilde\psi(t))$ is an integral curve of the vector field Y if and only if $t\mapsto(\varphi(t),\psi(t)$ is an integral curve of X. One can proceed as above to show $(\tilde\varphi(t),\tilde\psi(t))\in D'$ for any $t\in(T_1,T_1+\varepsilon)$ for a sufficient small positive number ε, and Y points in the interior of D' at each point of m_1 or σ. Noting that the only zero point $(\varphi_0,0)$ of Y in D' is a spiral point, one can conclude

the existence of $t_2 \in (T_1, +\infty)$, such that $(\tilde{\varphi}(t), \tilde{\psi}(t)) \in D'$ for each $t \in [T_1, t_2]$, and $(\tilde{\varphi}(t_2), \tilde{\psi}(t_2))$ lies in m_2. In other words,

$$\varphi(t_2) = \varphi_0, \quad \psi(t_2) \in [-\psi(t_1), 0) \subset [-\frac{1}{5}\varphi_0, 0). \tag{4.47}$$

Moreover

$$\varphi(t) + \psi(t) = \varphi(t) - \tilde{\psi}(t) \geq \varphi_0 - \psi(t_1) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0 \tag{4.48}$$

for any $t \in [T_1, t_2]$.

Denote

$$T_2 := \sup\{s \in (t_2, T_\infty] : \psi(t) < 0, \varphi(t) > 0 \text{ for each } t \in [t_2, s)\}. \tag{4.49}$$

Then $\psi(t) < 0$ for each $t \in (t_2, T_2)$ and hence $t \in [t_2, T_2) \mapsto \varphi(t)$ is strictly decreasing. It follows that $\varphi(t) \leq \varphi_0$ and $f_1(\varphi(t)) \geq 0$. Moreover,

$$(\varphi + \psi)_t = -(f_2(\varphi)\psi - f_1(\varphi)\varphi)\big[1 + (\varphi + \psi)^2\big] \geq 0.$$

Hence $\varphi(t) + \psi(t) \geq \varphi(t_2) + \psi(t_2) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0$ for every $t \in [t_2, T_2)$. If $T_2 = +\infty$, then $(\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ converges to $(0, 0)$ as $t \to -\infty$, which causes a contradiction to $\varphi(t) + \psi(t) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0$. Therefore $T_2 < +\infty$, $\psi(T_2) = 0$ and $\varphi(T_2) \in [\frac{4}{5}\varphi_0, \varphi_0)$.

Step 4. *Define the sequence* $\{T_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ *by induction.*

Assume $T_1, \cdots, T_{2m}$ have been defined, which satisfy

- $\psi(T_i) = 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq 2m$;
- $\frac{4}{5}\varphi_0 \leq \varphi_2 < \varphi_4 < \cdots < \varphi_{2m} < \varphi_0 < \varphi_{2m-1} < \cdots < \varphi_3 < \varphi_1$, with $\varphi_i := \varphi(T_i)$;
- $\psi(t) > 0$ for every $t \in (-\infty, T_1) \cup \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{m-1} (T_{2k}, T_{2k+1})\right)$;
- $\psi(t) < 0$ and $\varphi(t) + \psi(t) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0$ for all $t \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{m} (T_{2k-1}, T_{2k})$.

Let

$$T_{2m+1} := \sup\{s \in (T_{2m}, T_\infty] : \psi(t) > 0 \text{ for each } t \in (T_{2m}, s)\}. \tag{4.50}$$

Noting that any integral curve of X cannot intersect itself, one and only one of the following cases has to occur: (i) $T_{2m+1} = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \to +\infty} (\varphi(t), \psi(t)) = (\varphi_0, 0)$; (ii) $T_{2m+1} < +\infty$, $\psi(T_{2m+1}) = 0$ and $\varphi_{2m+1} := \varphi(T_{2m+1}) \in (\varphi_0, \varphi_{2m-1})$. Case (i) can be easily excluded, since it contradicts to the fact that $(\varphi_0, 0)$ is a spiral point. Thus $T_{2m+1} < +\infty$ and one can define

$$T_{2m+2} := \sup\{s \in (T_{2m+1}, T_\infty] : \psi(t) < 0 \text{ for each } t \in (T_{2m+1}, s)\}. \tag{4.51}$$

Similarly to above, one can show $T_{2m+2} < +\infty$, $\psi(T_{2m+2}) = 0$ and $\varphi_{2m+2} \in (\varphi_{2m}, \varphi_0)$. Since the integral curve of X cannot intersect itself,

$$\sup_{t \in (T_{2m+1}, T_{2m+2})} (\varphi + \psi)(t) \geq \sup_{t \in (T_{2m-1}, T_{2m})} (\varphi + \psi)(t) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0.$$

Finally, we obtain a sequence $\{T_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ satisfying the following properties:

- $\lim_{i\to\infty} T_i = +\infty$;
- $\psi(T_i) = 0$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$;
- $\{\varphi_{2m-1} : m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ is a strictly decreasing sequence, taking values in $(\varphi_0, +\infty)$, $\{\varphi_{2m} : m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ is a strictly increasing sequence, taking values in $[\frac{4}{5}\varphi_0, \varphi_0)$;
- $\psi(t) > 0$ for every $t \in (-\infty, T_1) \cup \left(\bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^+} (T_{2m}, T_{2m+1}) \right)$;
- $\psi(t) < 0$ and $\varphi(t) + \psi(t) \geq \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0$ for every $t \in \bigcup_{m\in\mathbb{Z}^+} (T_{2m-1}, T_{2m})$.

Step 5. *Prove* $\lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi(T_{2m}) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi(T_{2m-1}) = \varphi_0$.

Assume $a := \lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi(T_{2m}) < \varphi_0$, then the ω-set of this orbit should be a limit cycle, which is the integral curve of X passing through $(a, 0)$. More precisely, there exists a smooth solution $t \in [b_0, b_2] \mapsto (\varphi(t), \psi(t))$ to (3.25) and $b_1 \in (b_0, b_2)$, such that

- $\varphi(b_0) = a = \varphi(b_2)$;
- $\psi(b_0) = \psi(b_1) = \psi(b_2) = 0$;
- $\psi(t) > 0$ for any $t \in (b_0, b_1)$, $\psi(t) < 0$ for any $t \in (b_1, b_2)$.

This give a contradiction to Lemma 4.1, since $a > \frac{4}{5}\varphi_0 > \sqrt{\frac{3p-n-1}{3(n-p)}}$. Therefore $\lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi(T_{2m}) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \varphi(T_{2m-1}) = \varphi_0$, and $\lim_{t\to+\infty} \varphi(t) = (\varphi_0, 0)$. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.2.

References

1. F. J. Almgren: The theory of varifolds. Princeton mimeographed notes, 1965.
2. J. L. M. Barbosa: An extrinsic rigidity theorem for minimal immersion from S^2 into S^n. J. Diff. Geom. **14** (1980), 355-368.
3. M. Berger, P. Gauduchon and E. Mazet, Le spectre d'une variété riemannienne. Lecture notes in Math. **194**(1971), Springer.
4. E. Bombieri, E. de Giorgi and M. Miranda: Una maggiorazione a priori relativa alle ipersuperfici minimali non parametriche. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **32**(1969), 255-267.
5. W. M. Boothby: An introduction to differentiable manifolds and Riemannian geometry. Academic Press, 1987.
6. F. E. Burstall, D. Ferus, K. Leschke, F. Pedit and U. Pinkall: Conformal Geometry of surfaces in S^4 and Quaternions, Lecture note in Math. **1772**(2002), Springer.
7. E. Calabi: Minimal immersions of surfaces in euclidean spheres. J. Diff. Geom. **1**(1967), 111-125.
8. M. P. do Carmo and N. R. Wallach: Minimal immersions of spheres into spheres. Ann. Math. **93**(1971), 43-62.
9. I. Chavel: Eigenvalues in Riemannian geometry. Academic Press, 1984.
10. S. S. Chern and R. Osserman: Complete minimal surfaces in Euclidean $n-$space. J. d'Anal. Math. **19**(1967), 15-34.
11. S. Y. Cheng, P. Li and S. T. Yau: Heat equations on minimal submanifolds and their applications. Amer. J. Math. **106**(1984), 1033-1065.

12. T. H. Colding and W. P. Minicozzi II: A course in minimal surfaces. AMS Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 2011.
13. E. de Giorgi: Sulla differentiabilità el'analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari. Mem. accad. Sci. Totino, s. III, parte I, (1957), 25-43.
14. J. Douglas: Solutions of the Problem of Plateau: Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **33** (1931), 263-321.
15. W. Y. Ding and Y. Yuan: Resolving the singularities of the minimal hopf cones. J. Partial Diff. Eqs. **19**(2006), 218-231.
16. J. Eells and A. Ratto: Harmonic maps and minimal immersions with symmetries. Princeton University Press, 1993.
17. K. Falconer: Fractal geometry: mathematical foudations and applications. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2003.
18. H. Federer: Geometric Measure Theory. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1996.
19. D. Fischer-Colbrie: Some rigidity theorems for minimal submanifolds of the sphere. Acta math. **145**(1980), 29-46.
20. W. H. Fleming: On the oriented Plateau problem. Rend. Circolo Mat. Palermo **9**(1962), 69-89.
21. P. Hartman: Ordinary differential equations. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1964.
22. R. Harvey and H. B. Lawson: Calibrated geometries, Acta Math. **148**(1982), 47-157.
23. H. Jenkins and J. Serrin: The Dirichlet problem for the minimal surface equation in higher dimensions. J. Reine Angew. Math. **229**(1968), 170-187.
24. C. Jordan: Essais Sur la Géométrie à n Dimensions. Bull. Soc. Math. France **3**(1875), 103-174.
25. J. Jost and Y. L. Xin: Bernstein type theorems for higher codimension, Calc. Var. PDE **9** (1999), 277-296.
26. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: The Gauss image of entire graphs of higher codimension and Bernstein type theorems. Calc. Var. PDE **47**(2013), 711-737.
27. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: The geometry of Grassmannian manifolds and Bernstein type theorems for higher codimension. Ann. del. Scu. Norm. Sup. di Pisa **XVI**(2016), 1-39.
28. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: A spherical Bernstein theorem for minimal submanifolds of higher codimension. arXiv: 1405.5952.
29. J. Jost, Y. L. Xin and Ling Yang: Submanifolds with constant Jordan angles. arXiv: 1502.02797.
30. H. B. Lawson and R. Osserman: Non-existence, non-uniqueness and irregularity of solutions to the minimal surface system. Acta Math. **139**(1977), 1-17.
31. K. Mashimo: Degree of the standard isometric minimal immersions of complex projective spaces into spheres. Tsukuba J. Math. **4**(1980), 133-145.
32. K. Mashimo: Degree of the standard isometric minimal immersions of the symmetric spaces of rank one into spheres. Tsukuba J. Math. **5**(1981), 291-297.
33. C. B. Morrey: Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations. Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band 130, Springer-Verlag New York, 1966.
34. J. Moser: A new proof of de Giorgi's theorem concerning the regularity problem for elliptic differential equations. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **13**(1960), 457-468.
35. R. Osserman: A survey of minimal surfaces, the second ed., Dover Publ. Inc., New York, 1986.
36. O. M. Perdomo, G. X. Wei: n-dimensional area of minimal rotational hypersurfaces in spheres. Nonlinear Anal. **125**(2015), 241-250.
37. T. Radó: On Plateau's problem. Ann. Math. **31**(1930), 457-469.
38. T. Radó: On the Problem of Plateau. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und iher Grenzgebiete, vol. 2, Springer, 1933.
39. R. Schoen and S. T. Yau: Lectures on harmonic maps. BY International Press, 1997.
40. G. Toth: Eigenmaps and the space of minimal immersions between spheres. Indiana Univ. Math. J. **46** (1997), 637-658.
41. H. Urakawa: Minimal immersions of projective spaces into spheres. Tsukuba J. Math. **9**(1985), 321-347.
42. N. Wallach: Minimal immersions of symmetric spaces into spheres. Symmetric spaces, Pure and Appl. Math. Series 8, Marcel Dekker, 1972.

43. B. Wilking: Index parity of closed geodesics and rigidity of Hopf fibrations. Invent. Math. **144**(2001), 281-295.
44. Yung-Chow Wong: Differential geometry of Grassmann manifolds, Proc. N.A.S. **57** (1967), 589-594.
45. H. X. Wu, C. L. Shen and Y. L. Yu: An introduction to Riemannian geometry (in Chinese). Peking University Press, 1989.
46. Y. L. Xin: Geometry of harmonic maps. Birkhäuser, 1996.
47. Y. L. Xin: Minimal submanifolds and related topics, World Scientic Publ. 2003.
48. Y. L. Xin, L. Yang: Convex functions on Grassmannian manifolds and Lawson-Osserman problem. Adv. Math. **219**(2008), 1298-1326.
49. X. W. Xu, L. Yang and Y. S. Zhang: New area-minimizing Lawson-Osserman cones. To appear.

School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, Anhui province, China;

and Wu Wen-Tsun Key Laboratory of Mathematics, USTC, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, 230026, Anhui province, China.

E-mail address: xwxu09@ustc.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China.

E-mail address: yanglingfd@fudan.edu.cn

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, Jilin province, China.

E-mail address: yongsheng.chang@gmail.com